2649

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCXCII.

JULY, 1889.

DISCIPLINE IN AMERICAN COLLEGES.

BY PRESIDENT BARTLETT OF DARTMOUTH, PRESIDENT ANGELL OF MICHIGAN, PROFESSOR SHALER OF HARVARD, PRESIDENT ADAMS OF CORNELL, PRESIDENT HYDE OF BOWDOIN, PRINCIPAL DAWSON OF M'GILL, AND PRESIDENT DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA.

How far should a university control its students? The inquiry relates, of course, to the American, and not the European, university. The latter is quite a different institution from the former. The German university may be summarily characterized as a cluster of professional schools, preceded by the long (seven years) and rigid drill of the gymnasium. Oxford and Cambridge stand in a somewhat similar relation to such an elaborate training as is given at Winchester and Rugby. Of these universities it may be remarked in passing that they are sufficiently inflexible in the courses of study they prescribe and the amount of attendance they require for their degrees, and rigid in regard to some matters of conduct, though lax enough in others.

The American university is a very different affair. The name covers a variety of institutions, no one of which fully corresponds to the European one. Some of them have nothing of the foreign university character, but only the gymnasium or college elements, which, indeed, greatly predominate in our largest so-called universities, and are not wholly eliminated from Johns Hopkins.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Our universities being predominantly colleges, and the great majority of their students being under-graduates or college students, I propose to direct my suggestions to the question of controlling college students, with reference to whom primarily and almost exclusively it has been publicly raised. The proposition that the university student should choose his own studies and govern himself was originally applied to a body of young men the majority of whom were not properly university students.

It may be admitted that professional students are to some degree in different circumstances from college students. They are older and more mature; mostly men in years and experience. They have gone through an invaluable previous training, have a wider horizon of knowledge, and are held and urged by the near prospects of their life-work and the impending necessity of a livelihood. They should require much less of external guidance and control. Yet they are not left to themselves. Professional schools of all kinds firmly hold their students to certain prescribed courses of lectures, reading, examinations, and attendance, which are accepted by all parties as wise and necessary, and on which no further remark is here called for.

Students enter college mostly in the transition period from boyhood to manhood. Perhaps the average age in this country is not far from eighteen years. Some, indeed, are men, but very many are still boys. As a body they are at an age when, during nearly three-quarters of their college course, they are, by the wise laws of the land, under parental government. This patent fact alone would seem to furnish a valid basis for the answer to the question. I have heard it affirmed by a high college official that the notion of a college faculty standing *in loco parentis* is an exploded notion. If so, the more the pity. But there certainly are colleges, not a few, where it is not exploded or obsolete. By what right shall the parent, when he sends his son into new difficulties and temptations, consent to the withdrawal of all that guardian watch and care which the public polity and the wisdom of ages require of him while the son is at home? And by what right shall the institution to which the young man in his minority is entrusted by the parent assume that not only direct parental guardianship, but all substitute for it, is abrogated by the trust? I have heard it asserted, in a similar strain, that the whole duty of a college professor is discharged and ended in the lecture-room.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If these two maxims were settled principles in all our colleges, judicious parents might well hesitate, and even refuse, to send their sons to such places of irresponsibility. Better place them in any kind of apprenticeship, for then they would be held to duty and responsibility. But such views do not universally prevail. In many of our best institutions the personal influence of the instructors is even more efficient outside of the lecture-room than within it; and most institutions feel the obligation, so far as practicable, to supply the parent's moral influence, while furnishing the intellectual influences which he could not personally bestow. Otherwise the transition from the well-regulated home to the heartless institution would be the saddest of orphanages.

Furthermore, the clear underlying principle of the student's position carries with it the condition of control. He goes to college to be equipped for the thinking and acting of manhood. He goes unformed, inexperienced, susceptible, exposed, comparatively crude in judgments, and often abounding in juvenile tendencies to irregularity and excess. Now, are such young men to be coolly left to themselves, unaided by external supports? Or are they to be actively and positively helped in every available mode by the men to whom they have come for help,—by their knowledge, their experience, their riper judgment, their advice, and, so far as is needed, their wise and firm control? To ask the question is to answer it. To fail in the use of all such available influences is clearly a dereliction of duty and a breach of faith to the pupil. If the student is able to educate himself, why put himself under instructors and methods at all? For to choose one's studies and govern himself meanwhile, taken strictly, comprises the whole matter and method of education.

Let us apply these principles a little in detail. Clearly there should be a somewhat firm control of the attendance. Requirements of this nature, such as are insisted on in professional schools, are still more indispensable in the college. To form and fix habits of systematic, steady application is one of the prime benefits of a public school. The value of this one element of a right college training can hardly be overestimated. Few young men are so well established as to dispense with such regulations; the majority greatly need them; not a few would be life-long failures without them. And these regulations should require not only presence at the institution, but habitual attendance on its stated

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exercises, with allowance, of course, for reasonable excuses. Regular attendance is even easier than irregular, while the difference in the permanent effect on the individual is beyond computation. For this reason nothing is gained and much is lost by an excessive allowance of "cuts"; and protracted absences from the lecture-room are never compensated for by cramming for examination. One great institution, which had allowed unwonted latitude in this respect, has already found it necessary to begin a retreat.

Equally legitimate is a general prescription of the course or courses of study. A full discussion of this subject cannot be entered upon here. But so long as some professional schools find it needful rigidly to require the main part of professional education, objections to a similar procedure in the college fall to the ground. From the fact that he has not been over the field, the youth is incompetent to judge what is the best drill and culture for him. And while diversity of ultimate aim may modify the latter part of the basal education, specialism comes soon enough when the special training begins. And those institutions seem to me wisest which reserve their electives till the last half of the college course, then introduce them sparingly, and not miscellaneously, but by coherent courses. A general and predominant introduction of electives is fruitful of evils. It perplexes the faithful student in his inexperience. It tempts and helps the average student to turn away from the studies which, by reason of his deficiencies, he most needs. It gives opportunity to the lazy student to indulge his indolence in the selection of "soft" electives. Striking and even ludicrous illustrations of these last two influences could readily be furnished, did the space permit. Other undesirable influences of the premature multiplication of electives, affecting the students as a body, have already been apprehended by some who strongly favored the system—in regard to which we may await further developments.

Regulations governing the conduct and deportment of the young men in their relations as students are also indispensable. No considerable company can get on without well-settled rules adapted to their special circumstances. To attempt it is confusion. The well-disposed majority need them for guidance, the ill-disposed minority for restraint, and all for comfort and protection. College codes have properly been made simpler than formerly, when English precedents prevailed. But firm codes are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

none the less indispensable. In view of facts constantly coming to the knowledge of the public, as within a few weeks in regard to the acts of students of at least four "universities," and multitudes of facts well known to college faculties, it has a comic aspect to talk of the student's governing himself. He must be governed, wisely and kindly, but governed. He is, by his accepted condition, "under tutors and governors." The coöperation of the young men should be secured, as far as practicable, and friendly relations maintained between student and faculty. This is, happily, taking place more and more. But neither individually nor collectively are students the persons to govern. They are not there to guide and regulate, but to be guided and regulated. It belongs to their age and fundamental relation. Not myself believing in the surrender of college government to college students, I will not criticise the views of those who do. I may say, however, that so far as my observation goes, the seeming surrender is but superficial, the faculty retaining always the ultimate control, referring only what it is pleased to refer, and with a veto power behind. But however this may be, it is certain that in some institutions the students themselves advocate no such arrangement. Thus at Dartmouth College, where the general good order will probably bear a comparison with that of any other New England college of an equal number of students, not only have the young men, in their free class discussions, always decided adversely to the plan, but their college periodical, on the 19th of last April, put forth a vigorous protest against the scheme, ridiculing it as "an abortive attempt" by the "ukase of a single sentence" to transmute "impulsive youth, needing guidance and restraint," into "mature men," dominated by wisdom and principle. It affirmed that the student's daily actions give the lie to the oft-repeated statement that appeals to his honor alone are necessary, pronounced the strong government to be the one that is "respected," and ended with the assertion: "What our colleges really need is more of West Point." Unquestionably students respect a firm and impartial college *government.*

I only add, without arguing, the opinion, resting on the principles previously indicated, that a general religious control should be asserted—not sectarian, but Christian: daily attendance on chapel service, and attendance on some Sunday public service, according to the preference of the parent or guardian. It is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pleasant to see many recent indications that public sentiment is moving again in this direction.

S. C. BARTLETT,
President of Dartmouth College.

I ASSUME that we who are asked to discuss the question, "How far should a university control its students?" are expected to consider chiefly the management of collegiate students rather than of students in professional schools.

Like the similar question, "How far shall a father control his son between the ages of seventeen and twenty-one?" it is easy enough to give an answer in general terms, but not easy to give one in detailed and specific terms.

Probably all will agree that the college authorities should aim to do all in their power to bring the student through his college course with a vigorous body, a mind well-disciplined and stored with knowledge, and a pure, strong, and manly character. The control which is essential to the accomplishment of this result with the great body of students may be, and should be, exercised. But there are serious practical difficulties in applying this simple principle in the management of a college.

There is the very grave difficulty which arises from the difference in the ages of the students. Some of them are in years, and in physical, mental, and moral development, mere boys; others are mature men. It is not at all unusual to find students sixteen years old and those twenty-five or even thirty years old in the same class. Methods useful with the former are absurd with the latter. If we may borrow terms from the German schools to express our thought, we may say that we are embarrassed by having in the American colleges boys so young that gymnasial methods, both of intellectual and moral training, are suitable for them, and men old enough and sufficiently advanced in mental development to be trained under university methods. I think the average age of the students in the Western colleges and universities is somewhat higher than that in the Eastern institutions of similar grade. This may in part account for what I suppose to be a fact,—that rather more freedom is accorded to students in most of the larger Western colleges than in most of the Eastern. The average age of those admitted to the freshman class in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

University of Michigan for many years has ranged from nineteen to nineteen and a half years. The average age of the undergraduate here is about twenty-one. Of course, such a body of students can be treated differently from a body whose average age is nineteen. Still, as a few of our students are only sixteen, we are not free from the embarrassment named.

Another difficulty springs from the fact that with a large proportion of students the college life falls at the period when their passions and impulses are at their maximum strength, and when experience and reason have not taught them self-control in a large degree. Though not vicious, they may be thoughtless, and are often carried away in a whirl of temporary excitement to words and acts which they soon after condemn. What is wise treatment of young men in these moods is not always easy to say.

Again, the problem of college government is often made serious from the fact that too often students, from some cause, have regarded the relations of college teachers to them as antagonistic; have felt that it was their privilege, if not their right and duty, to outwit their guardians and cause them as much trouble as possible. This is an old college tradition, for the existence of which students are not alone responsible. It is in part due to unwise methods of government, more in vogue formerly than now, and especially to attempts to exercise excessive control of students. The tradition, however,—and hardly anything is more enduring and invincible than a college tradition,—still afflicts some colleges whose faculties no longer give provocation for this hostile attitude of their pupils.

To meet these and other difficulties, what means of control are commanded by the college authorities?

First, they can make and, so far as practicable, enforce rules and regulations to govern the conduct of students.

Secondly, they have the moral aid of the elevating and regulating power of the intellectual pursuits of their pupils, and also of such appeals as can be made to them when assembled.

Thirdly, the personal power of the teachers in their close intercourse with the students can be employed in removing the pestilent idea of official antagonism to them, and in elevating their aims and character.

Of these three instrumentalities for controlling students, the first should be used as little as possible, and the other two as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

much as possible. Control by mere authority should be used as little as is compatible with the high ends sought in the conduct of a college. It must, indeed, be made plain to students, so that there is no shadow of a ground for misunderstanding on the point, that the faculty, and not the students, govern the college. But this being established, let the rules be as few and as simple as possible, and only such as can be reasonably well enforced. Let the hand of authority be displayed only when indispensably necessary. Punctuality in attendance and fidelity in work should be insisted on. If a fair degree of success in obtaining these is secured, the other details of the student's life may generally be left to him with safety. But he should be made to understand that a decent and manly life is expected of him always and everywhere. It is unwise and useless to confront him, in a pamphlet of college laws, with a long list of *mala prohibita*, which he is forbidden to commit. No college faculty has genius enough to name all the acts which ought to be forbidden. The wily student who is presented with the catalogue of forbidden sins is tempted to commit all which are not included in the list. But he knows what is decent and becoming and manly as well as the Professor of Moral Philosophy, and if informed that conduct which is manly will always be expected of him, he is much more likely to refrain from unbecoming acts than if held in subjection to a long code of petty rules and to a system of espionage.

The professors should not depend so much for the control of students on legislation as on getting near enough to their pupils to exert a positive moral influence upon them, on appeals to their manliness, on engendering in them the spirit of right-doing. Some teachers lack this power. But it should be coveted and sought after as one of the "best gifts" of a college officer. Members of the faculty should spare no personal efforts to induce students to abandon bad traditions and usages. They should strive to reach and control the younger students through the counsel and influence of the older. That is one of the most effective ways of controlling thoughtless, impulsive students. By all means the attempt should be constantly made to produce a public opinion in college in favor of manly conduct and in condemnation of all kinds of unmanly conduct, from mere childish tricks to disorder and vice.

Nor will a wise administration content itself with dealing with students as a mass. There should be most careful and considerate

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treatment of individual cases. The number who are inclined to go wrong is usually small, unless in some special excitement which takes good men for the moment off their feet. That small number should be constantly looked after with the desire to make something of them if possible. Sometimes a professor who has special nearness of access to one of these men can do more for him than the executive officer of the college. But by sympathetic admonitions and appeals, by enlisting in the work older students, who are his friends, by all means at command, the effort should be made to save him to a career of industry and virtue if possible. If he cannot be saved, of course he must be made to withdraw ; but unless he has been guilty of some flagrant offence, there should be as little demonstration as possible about his withdrawal. There is room for great wisdom and tact in dealing with these individual cases, which form the centres of wrong-doing.

While, then, it should be distinctly understood as not open to debate that the faculty must govern the college, and must absolutely decide in any issue between them and the students, still the constant aim and unceasing study should be to make it unnecessary for them to use their authority by cultivating in all ways among the students the manly and earnest spirit which makes the resort to authority unnecessary, and especially by leading the students to feel that their teachers are not spies and antagonists, but their true friends, eager to assist them in every way. A great improvement has taken place in this generation in the relations of college officers and students, and in the general demeanor of students. That improvement has been largely due to the adoption to a greater or less extent of the principles advocated in this paper. In most colleges the petty and detailed supervision of the student's daily and hourly life has been relaxed or abandoned. Less reliance for insuring good conduct is now placed on manifold restraints than on the appeal to a manly spirit in the student. I am of the opinion that the introduction of the elective system in the latter part of the college course has also been most beneficial from a moral, as well as from an intellectual, point of view. The compulsory pursuit of unwelcome studies in the junior and senior years used to cause much friction and discontent.

But notwithstanding the gratifying improvement which this generation has seen in the management of colleges and in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manners and life of undergraduates, this question of the amount and kind of control which should be exercised will continue to present difficulties so long as the college has to conduct both gymnasial and university work.

As to professional schools, when a part of universities, the same general principles as to work, attendance, and life are applicable as in the college, though, owing to the more advanced years of the students, certain obvious modifications in the application of these rules may be made. There is now a wholesome tendency to more rigorous demands on professional students than have been made in years past.

JAMES B. ANGELL,
President of the University of Michigan.

IN CONSIDERING the problem of discipline in our higher institutions of learning, it is well first to place clearly before our minds the immediate objects which such establishments should have in view. It is evident that these objects must go far to determine the system by which the conduct of youths who attend our colleges and universities is to be controlled. It is very clear that the essential aim of our higher educational establishments is to take youths who have received a considerable training in preparatory schools, who have attained the age of about eighteen years, and have begun to acquire the motives of men, and fit them for the higher walks of active life. To the youth must be given a share of learning which may serve to enlarge to the utmost his natural powers. He must be informed and disciplined in the art and habit of acquiring information. He must also be disciplined in the ways of men, in the maintenance of his moral status by the exercise of his will, in self-confidence, and in the faithful performance of duty for duty's sake. Every influence which tends to aid him in putting away the irresponsible nature of the child should be brought to bear; every condition which will lead him to send forth his expectations and ambitions from his place in the school to his place among men should surround him.

While all persons who have considered the problem of higher education will doubtless agree with the proposition that our university authorities should endeavor above all things to bring the youths under their care into the independent position of men, they doubtless perceive that there are very considerable difficulties in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the way of attaining this result. The most serious of these arises from the fact that in our larger colleges and universities a great number of young men, generally of imperfect family training, and often from preparatory schools where the influences are not calculated to develop discreet manly qualities, are crowded together under conditions which separate them from the influences which ordinarily control men. The surprise of the new position and the contagious effects of evil example on immature minds breed certain dangers which the authorities of these institutions have to meet by various methods of discipline. Control of some sort has to be exercised by the college authorities. The important question is as to the measure and nature of the influences which may be necessary to apply in order to secure a proper regulation of life on the part of young men.

The influences which may be brought to bear in order to secure good conduct on the part of students clearly fall into two classes. In one fear is the motive. The student may be forced to pursue a particular path by the knowledge that punishment awaits transgressions. The punishment may consist of deprivation of various privileges and exclusion from the institution, or in the chastisement which may be secured through the anxiety which his actions bring to his kindred and friends. There can be no question that fear is a powerful agent in controlling the conduct of men. A large part of our social machinery rests upon the fear as to the formal effects of misdoing. It is clear, however, that, while fear may often be valuable as a deterrent, it has not only no moral quality, but by its presence prevents the action of the moral motives. Fear is, unhappily, the necessary element of the laws which serve to hold society together, but all must acknowledge that the real good won by the advance either of the individual man or of society is gained in realms of action which lie quite without the control of this essentially base impulse. It is true that, when we limit the youth's action by anxiety lest his kindred should be distressed by his conduct, we bring into his mind something of a higher motive than purely selfish considerations. Still the element of fear remains, and with it comes the motive to conceal the evil which he has done. It is in this element of concealment, which fear induces, that we find the most debasing effects arising from any discipline which has formal punishments for sanctions. Where young men are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under the influence of a discipline that sets immediate personal penalties for offences, the temptation is to hide their evil doings from the authorities and to feel that, if they can secure secrecy, they escape the consequences of their acts. The more rigorous the discipline within the limits possible in a school of high grade, the more this furtive motive is developed. It is my conviction that the more successful the discipline of fear in controlling youths, the more completely it fails to accomplish an educative purpose.

Fortunately for the interests of education, there is another way of controlling the conduct of young men in our educational establishments. We may seek to affect their conduct, not to any extent through fear of immediate punishment, but by setting before them the nature of the great task which has brought them to the universities. Once bring a young man clearly to feel that his career in life is fairly begun when he resorts to college or the professional school; let him but conceive that his place in life is to be determined by his conduct in preparation for it, and we bring to bear a set of motives which are morally as high as the ordinary motives of discipline are low in the moral scale. Just so far as the work of a student abounds in suggestions of his work in the world, so far as his teachers by their conduct, as well as by their words, serve to arouse his manly, dutiful sense, the education effects its true end. Every youth who is fitted to be a student in our higher colleges or universities will quickly respond to the stimulus he feels in passing from the disciplinary conditions of childhood to those which are fit for men. If he be in spirit capable of scholarly manliness, we may be sure that his imagination has forerun the conditions he has met in his lower schooling. He has longed for something like the independence and responsibility of manhood; for an advance to the place of trust to which he is bidden. For my own part, I find that the quick response to the freedom which my own college gives to youths is an admirable touchstone of quality. Where a young man does not quickly and eagerly take up the burden of trust which is confided to him, I have little hope of his future. He may blunder a bit, but unless there is something which may be fairly called a passion for the man's duties, it seems to me he is unfitted for higher education. Such a youth best be placed at once in some well-controlled occupation, where he will not have to depend, as the scholar does, upon his own initiative, where he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may be supported in daily duty by the stimulants of necessity. Remember that few are called to the peculiar work for which the university trains men. The places it undertakes to fill are not suited to more than perhaps one in twenty of our young men. Some basis of selection must exist, and the surest I have been able to find is the capacity of the student to take himself in care.

Many circumstances serve to make our students ready for a more trust-bearing system of control. The ancient form of family discipline, where fear had a large place, where the son was wont to tremble at the wrath of the father, is passing, if, indeed, it has not quite passed, away. The old-fashioned stern control of a thoroughly-disciplined college, where the students were kept in subjection by the application of formalized rules of conduct, really represents the spirit of a family system which no longer exists. Nowhere else is the fundamental democracy of this country—a motive far stronger than is comprehended by the most of our publicists—so clearly marked as in the freedom of the American family. The relation between the American boy and his parents is generally one of perfect friendliness, in which the old control by fear has hardly any place. There are, it is true, those who lament the disappearance of discipline from our households; but such persons fail to comprehend the deeper currents of their time. The alteration in the form of family and academic discipline is a part of the vast democratic humanization which is changing the fundamental motives of our people. In preserving the ancient theory of relations between young men and those who are set over them, our colleges are maintaining an archaic system. Moreover, the students who now attend our higher colleges and universities are very much older than they were fifty years ago. It is hardly too much to say that the age of entering is not far from that at which students graduated when the common systems of discipline were framed. Furthermore, about all our higher colleges there have grown up professional schools and graduate departments, whose students are practically exempt from all the police control. These schools are commonly closely related to the academic department; the students are often housed together, and not infrequently share certain portions of the instruction, with the result that it is much more difficult to maintain a rigorous discipline in the college.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To change the system of discipline in our colleges from that which fits children to that which is suited to the conditions of men requires many important modifications in the conditions under which the students pursue their academic life. In the first place, it is necessary to have some approach to what is known as the elective system. The student must feel that he has to select, under advice, the studies which he is to pursue in order to fit himself for his career in the world. This repeated choice is, as a feature in education, worth more than any other instruction which he receives in the college, for the reason that it brings him at once into contact with the problems of life. Next, it is necessary to have a far larger proportion of instructors, and those of higher quality, than is necessary under the old disciplinary control. I am inclined to think that it is necessary to have for the best operation of this system about one instructor of satisfactory quality to each twelve students. The method of work must be such that the teachers come in very close contact with the students. The relation between officers and students must not be very remote, as under the unhuman system common of old, but one of man to man. Each student must be thoroughly well known by some member of the faculty, who feels in a way responsible for his conduct in life. When these relations are brought about, all mechanical systems of control tend at once to disappear.

So far this humanized method of control has been made the matter of most careful experiment in Harvard College. For many years the government of that institution has been tending towards this method of discipline. The steps which have led to the change in the method of control have been slowly accomplished in the course of thirty years. At first the advances towards the new system were resisted by the more conservative elements in the governing bodies, but each step forward has been attended by such evidence of gains in the scholarly and manly motives of the students that in the faculty at least—the body which comes in closest contact with the student life—there is now no one opposed to the innovation. No one doubts that the change has been in a high measure profitable both to the intellectual and moral quality of the youths. The young men are made ready for the work of the world in a simpler and more effective manner than under the old system.

It cannot be denied that there are certain, though limited, disadvantages connected with this change in the method of con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trol. Wild youths, those affected by an excess of animal spirits, as well as those who are in a greater or less measure immoral, become more of a nuisance to their fellow-members of the university and the general public than of old. On the other hand, it is easier for the authorities to deal with these patent evils. Experience shows that the proportion of those who fail to meet their obligations is very small. A careful study of the young men in Harvard College during my career as a teacher, which now extends to a quarter of a century, has satisfied me that the percentage of those who go wrong under the system of freedom is very much less than under the old arbitrary, but ineffective, discipline. I am convinced, against my former prejudices, that we are on the right track, that our system is fitted to the time and state of our people, and that it promises to make youths ready for the service of society more quickly and certainly than the former method.

N. S. SHALER,
Harvard University.

THE question asked is one which seems, theoretically, to admit of an easy answer. And yet in practical university life there are not a few difficulties to be met. A boy should be directed and restrained; while to a man should be given the range of a large discretion. But the college student is often neither a boy nor a man; since, on the one hand, he refuses to be treated as a child, and, on the other, he finds it impossible to conduct himself like a human being that has passed the period of infancy. Reference is here made, of course, to that species of featherless biped which at times, especially when taken alone, seems to show many of the characteristics of rational intelligence, but which, when merged into a crowd of its fellows, is apt, on the least provocation, to part with its power of thought and lapse into all manner of irrational ways. What shall be done with such a creature is one of the practical problems that the college official has to meet.

It goes without saying that in every college community in which the atmosphere is fairly wholesome the great mass of students need no government whatever. If they know what the university requires of them, that is enough. But there are likely to be a few who refuse with more or less persistency to be included in this class. There is the lad who comes to the university with no very grave faults, but who is possessed with the notion that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the chief end of man is to have what he calls "a good time." He is not intemperate or immoral, according to the conventional usage of those words, but he has great energy of nature, and his pent-up enthusiasms crave that kind of excitement which comes from an energetic cane-rush or a good case of hazing. There is another who is not troubled with any craving for such laborious recreation, but is stubbornly indifferent to anything that comes in his way. He accepts whatever is offered with placid equanimity, and never either experiences enthusiasm or indulges in disgust. In short, he is what is called a good boy, and has no bad habits, except, possibly, that of not passing examinations. Then there is the class with positively vicious inclinations. These are they who frequent places of ill repute, and drag others in their train. They usually are endowed with certain elements of strength that enable them to stand up under a larger amount of dissipation than their fellows can carry. They are sometimes good scholars, and they often have the reputation of being what are called good fellows. They are apt to go straight to the bad; but sometimes they face about and become useful men. It is with such classes that the governing officer has to deal; for in the matter of discipline and government he has no occasion to think of the ninety-and-nine that need no repentance.

One of the first things to be insisted upon is the doctrine that every student will be regarded as an individual person and not as a member of a class. There is nothing more likely to fail than to attempt to deal with a class or a set as a whole. The most obdurate offender, when taken alone, can often be influenced by reason, but when he is arraigned in the presence of classmates, his pride is enlisted on the wrong side of the case, and the effect is almost certain to prove unsuccessful. Many a college officer has found to his sorrow that a class meeting is capable of infinite folly, and if the notion comes to prevail that a class can have any influence whatever in shaping faculty action, bad results will be almost certain to follow. It may be stated as a rule that the best elements of a class do not direct class action. The meetings very generally consist of what may be called the fermenting elements of the class. The most judicious men are quite apt to think it is as well to attend to their own business as to devote themselves to the business of others. They therefore temperately refrain from having too much to do with the ardent spirits of the class. And

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so it often happens that a class meeting is a sort of juvenile caucus, without that shrewd regulating element which persistent experience is, in the end, sure to develop. Under this condition of class organization and custom it is not strange that the wrong thing is quite as likely to be recommended as the right thing. Hence it is not unwholesome to have the notion prevail in a college that a class meeting will injure any cause that it recommends. It is unwholesome to have the opinion prevalent that affairs are in the hands of the boys.

It may well be inferred that these views are not compatible with what may be called the democratic form of university government. There are probably few things more needed in America than a spirit of respectful obedience to recognized authority. It is as true as it is trite to say that a man is never fit to command till he knows how to obey. Our educated classes should not have this part of their education neglected. It is because this very important element of our education is not neglected in our Government schools that all over the world our military and naval officers are recognized and praised for those qualities which mark them unmistakably as belonging to a distinguished order of gentlemen.

Students as a class have no respect for hesitation or weakness: on the contrary, they have a real admiration and liking for power. Of course, power must rest upon reason and must be exercised with wisdom. If the student community is convinced that the authority of the faculty is generally wielded in a spirit of reasonableness, it will have far more respect for the source of that authority than it would have if the faculty were to show distrust of themselves by calling in the advice of those whom it is their business to guide and teach. If the assumption of superiority of the professor over the student in judgment as well as knowledge is to be abandoned, why is the student any longer to seek instruction?

Undoubtedly, authority must be exercised with great discretion. It is probably true that in general the colleges have far too many rules. There is nothing more unfortunate than the supposition on the part of students that anything is admissible provided it has not been specifically prohibited. Almost equally pernicious is the habit of nagging students for their small faults. Far more wholesome results may be obtained by the inculcation of general principles, leaving the application

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of these principles to the judgment of students themselves, and then holding them responsible for the manner in which this trust is administered. Perhaps the most useful rule ever promulgated in an American school was that simple one which declared that every student was required at all times to conduct himself in a manner becoming a gentleman and a scholar, and that he would be held responsible for the observance of this standard. Such a requirement appeals to the approving reason of the student, and on the basis of it all needed discipline may readily be enforced. If students are duly made to feel that order is as much the first law of a university as it is the first law of heaven, they will have no difficulty in understanding that rushing and hazing will not be tolerated by any institution entitled to respect.

In a word, then, the requirements in regard to conduct should be few in number and should be of a character that will commend them to the approval of all reasonable minds. It should be understood from the first that college officials cannot expend their energies in playing the part of police officers. As soon as it is unmistakably apparent that any student is disposed persistently to defy or even to disregard the requirements of the institution, he should be promptly remanded to another field of usefulness. This is the course of wisdom: any other course is the course of weakness and folly.

CHARLES KENDALL ADAMS,
President of Cornell University.

TO WHAT extent should a university control its students? This is a complicated question. There are at least five departments of student life which may be subject to control: the intellectual; the religious; the moral; the physical; and deportment in and about college buildings. Then there are two kinds of control: official—by law and penalty; and personal—by advice and remonstrance. And, finally, the name university, as popularly used in a discussion like this, includes two distinct types of institutions: the centrally-located university, including professional schools and a post-graduate department; and the country college devoted wholly or chiefly to under-graduates. Hence our question includes five separate questions, each of which must be considered in two distinct relations; and all our conclusions will require

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

qualification according to the character of the institution to which they are applied.

First: intellectual control. The official control over the intellectual work of students should be strict and absolute. A requirement should be fixed and rigidly enforced. To allow a student to remain in a college when he is not doing a reasonable amount of work is a three-fold wrong. It is a wrong to the parent; for it is receiving his money under false pretences. It is a wrong to the student; for it confirms him in habits of indolence and irresponsibity. It is a wrong to the community; for it leads people to place that confidence which training and intelligence alone merit in those who have them not. The personal control over the intellectual life of students consists in restraining from excessive study the over-ambitious few; stimulating to greater effort the thoughtless many, who, though well above the official requirement, are yet far below the level of their own possible attainment; and giving advice concerning methods of work and choice of studies to all. There are two methods of enforcing this intellectual control. One insists upon absolute regularity of attendance. The other demands satisfactory results. Each method has its advantages and its disadvantages. The former cultivates regular habits, and is better adapted to younger students and to small colleges. The latter develops character through freedom, and is more harmonious with the university spirit.

Second: religious control. The extent to which official religious control is profitable depends upon the nature of the institution. In universities where a considerable proportion of the students are engaged in professional and post-graduate study, and in institutions supported by the state, attendance upon religious exercises may well be made voluntary. In colleges composed chiefly of under-graduates, supported by private benevolence, where, as is the case with nearly all our small colleges, Christian character and usefulness, quite as much as intellectual training and attainments, were the motive of their founders and benefactors, it is reasonable and right to require attendance at daily prayers in the college chapel and at public worship upon the Sabbath. The personal control of the religious life of students should be gained by friendly council and conference on religious topics; by pointing out the religious bearings of college work and college life; and by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the force of Christian character and example. The fact that the convictions and ideals which are to mould character and determine conduct are being formed by scores and perhaps hundreds of their students renders this one of the most important and responsible relations of every college professor for whom religious truth and duty have a serious significance.

Third: moral control. The college should enforce outward conformity with the recognized rules and requirements of morality and the standards of gentlemanly behavior. It should repress and punish overt acts which reflect discredit upon the college, and expel students guilty of flagrant and notorious immorality. The president and professors should maintain also a watchful interest in the morals of the students, and by personal efforts, and by communication with parents and friends, should throw around each student the support and sympathy in doing right, the reproof and remonstrance for doing wrong, which he has been accustomed to receive at home, and which he might expect to receive anywhere from friends interested in his welfare.

Fourth: physical control. The extent to which physical control can be carried profitably depends upon the extent to which formal requirements are carried in other departments. Where attendance at prayers and recitations is largely voluntary, and where studies are elective, required physical exercise would be incongruous. Yet where definite requirements as to time, place, and method are made in other departments, it is proper to require a thorough physical examination and regular prescribed physical exercise of every student. The college authorities should exclude from severe athletic contests all who, from constitutional defects or from inadequate training, cannot engage in them with perfect safety; and should limit games and contests to such times and places as will not interfere seriously with study.

Fifth: deportment in and about the college buildings. The college should aim to secure such order and quiet as are necessary for successful study. This should be done in such a manner as to leave the students as free as possible from interference and inspection. In the smaller colleges this control may be delegated to a representative body of students. Such a body will tolerate in minor matters some things which the faculty would not approve; yet, on the other hand, they can ascertain and punish much more precisely and effectively such offences as are clearly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

detrimental to the general welfare. And any lack of rigor that may result from such a system is more than counterbalanced by the greater self-control and self-respect it develops in the students, and the more sympathetic and confidential relation it renders possible between students and faculty. And where this spirit of self-control is developed, and this friendly relation between students and professors is maintained, the general overthrow of foolish customs, handed down from earlier days, when students were mere schoolboys and the faculty was regarded as their natural enemy, will be only a question of time.

Such being, in brief outline, the chief lines of legitimate control of the university over its students, what results may we look for? If we expect students in all cases to be as eager in the pursuit of learning as members on the floor of the Stock Exchange are in quest of gain; if we expect them always and everywhere to be as sedate and solemn in their demeanor as deacons at a religious meeting; if we expect them in all relations to be as considerate of each other's feelings as polite people at a party; if we expect them to be as discreet and judicious in all they do and say as Senators engaged in a serious deliberation,—of course we shall be disappointed, and captious critics will find abundant opportunity to make merry over the short-comings of college authorities and the misdoings of college boys. If, however, along with some false ambition and more shirking indifference, we secure a fair amount of mental growth and intellectual attainment from nine-tenths of every class; if, with a good deal of healthy protestantism toward traditional dogmas and some conceited contempt for spiritual realities, we develop in the majority a reasonable and reverent regard for religious truth and duty; if, with deliberate vice in a few and more or less thoughtless folly in many, we cultivate in nearly all an honest and earnest purpose to do right and a willingness to sacrifice private interests to noble and generous aims; if, with an occasional physical break-down from too little exercise and an occasional mental failure from too much sport, we send out the great mass of graduates with sound minds in sound bodies; if, with now and then a spontaneous outbreak of general disorder and with habitual neglect of opportunities on the part of individuals here and there, the average student is kept profitably employed throughout the year,—the college and university accomplish as much with the youth committed to their charge as faithful

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parents succeed in doing with their own sons and daughters of the same age, and as much as a thoughtful public reasonably can expect.

WILLIAM DEWITT HYDE,
President of Bowdoin College.

ANY title that the writer may have to be regarded as an authority on this important question arises from the fact that for thirty-three years he has been at the head of a growing university, which has risen in that time from little more than fifty to nearly six hundred students, and in which there has been no instance of any college rebellion or serious disturbance. For this exemption, however, I do not take credit to myself. The McGill University has had an able and devoted governing board, a body of competent, diligent, and popular professors, derived from a large number of different universities on both sides of the Atlantic; and the Canadian student is, on the whole, a hard worker, and not too self-asserting. In these circumstances, my experience may not have been exactly the same with that of some other college officers.

The question, How far should a university control its students? seems to imply that some control should be exercised. It would seem at the present day that this should scarcely be taken for granted. When it is the custom to govern nations by the votes of the plebs, however uneducated and incompetent, why should not the students control their professors, and dictate what they should be taught and how they should learn, or at least what restraints, if any, should be imposed on them. Independently of this, we are, by would-be reformers, referred even to the ancient mediæval customs which, in the origin of university life, made the community of students that which constituted the university, simply by resorting to some popular teacher for instruction. But in those days both professor and student were supposed to be under the control of mother church, which regulated all their doings and left little scope for private judgment of any kind. To some extent this ecclesiastical control still exists in certain denominational colleges, but in these it is a fertile source of disturbance, owing to the friction between the counter-currents of modern and ancient ideas, which, by their movement in opposite directions tend to produce whirlwinds or tornadoes of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opinion and action. It is to be observed, however, that even under the most democratic forms of government, when the community collectively, or a majority of it, elects its magistrates, the individual members become bound to obey, under such laws as may be in force.

Farther, the student is not a finished character, or a person in a fixed or stationary condition; he is in a state of pupilage, and of active mental and moral growth and development, not having yet reached, though tending toward, an ultimate position of independence. It follows from this that the individual growth of the student is an important factor in the case—perhaps the important factor—and that the influence exerted on him is not like that of chiselling a block of marble or hammering a bar of iron, but like that of regulating the growth of a young tree or of determining the course of a running stream. The educator is thus not a mere workman, but a trainer of an organism vastly complicated in structure and relations, and in a constant state of growth and development and of accommodation to its environment. This consideration unquestionably greatly complicates the question of control, since very slight influences acting on vital tissues may produce the most far-reaching effects; and no control should be of such a nature as to interfere with due vitality and symmetrical development.

Under these limitations, then, it may be assumed that some control or guidance must be exercised by the instructor, and that it may differ in kind as well as in degree, and may refer to individual moral character and conduct, to social relations, to educational work, and, in connection with this, to the relations of students with one another and with their teachers as part of an educational community, in which, as in all communities, some sacrifice of individual liberty must be made in the interest of the great ends to be secured by the association. In the case in question these ends are of the highest order, and it can scarcely be assumed that the individual student is in a position to judge independently as to these ends and the means of their attainment, or that even the collective wisdom of the students will be adequate to this, previous to any experience on their part of the course they are to follow. These considerations may be summed up under the short statement that any one travelling on a road unknown to him by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

experience will be the better for the guidance of some one who has gone the same way previously.

Keeping these general statements in view, it will simplify matters to ask the question with reference to institutions purely educational and not under ecclesiastical control, and with reference to institutions for general education rather than that which is special or professional. If I confine myself to my own experience, the further limitation will be imposed that McGill does not provide residences for its students, and it is well known that the inmates of college boarding-houses have a somewhat special relation to the university, as distinguished from those who lodge in private houses and simply attend lectures.

With these limitations I may further explain that in McGill University each faculty exercises jurisdiction over its own students, the executive officer beiug the dean of the faculty. The principal intervenes only when desired to give advice or assistance, or when any case arises affecting students of different faculties; and the power of expelling students resides only in the corporation—a body including the governors, the principal, and all the deans of the faculties, with elective representatives of the faculties, of the affiliated colleges, and of the graduates.

Under this system it is understood that each professor is supreme in his own class-room, but his power of discipline is limited to a temporary suspension from lectures, which must be at once reported to the dean. If necessary, the dean may lay the case before the faculty, which, after hearing, may reprimand, report to parents or guardians, impose fines, suspend from classes, or, in extreme cases, report to the corporation for expulsion. No case involving this last penalty has, however, yet occurred, and the effort in all cases is to settle every case of discipline by personal influence and with as little reference to laws and penalties as possible.

With this machinery a simple code of rules is sufficient. It provides for orderly and moral conduct in the buildings and in going and coming, and for the safety of the property of the university, and prohibits all action likely to obstruct the work of the college or to interfere with the progress of other students. In the case of college societies it is required merely that their objects shall be consistent with those of the university, and that their laws and officers shall be communicated to and approved by the faculty in whose rooms they meet.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Above and beyond all such machinery and rules lies the obligation on principal, deans, and professors to watch the beginnings of evil and to counteract by wise and kindly advice anything that may lead to disorder. On the one hand, the effort should be to allow all that liberty which tends to make students self-reliant and fit for the battle of life, and, on the other, to prevent the formation of any habits of life inimical to the interests of their fellow-students or injurious to themselves.

I believe this constant kindly watchfulness, without anything of the nature of espionage, and observing the distinction between trifles that, however annoying for the moment, lead to nothing and those breaches of discipline that may have important consequences, constitutes the best safeguard for order, while the cultivation of interest and enthusiasm for college work at once secures progress and peace. In short, the control of young men or young women is to be exercised rather in the way of inducing them to like their work and duty than by any influence of the nature of coercion or restraint. In this way only can they be trained to control themselves and, when their turn comes, to control others. They who would rule must themselves learn willing obedience. Of course, there is place here for all the elevating influence of spiritual religion, and there is scope for that most important power which arises from the example of punctuality, self-denial, and honest work on the part of professors.

In connection with this it may be proper to remark that the most serious difficulties met with by college administrators often arise not directly from the students, but from the action of instructors and other officers. When these are careless, incompetent, irritable, or exacting, difficulties are certain to occur, and are not lessened by the necessity to sustain, at least for the time, legitimate authority, in the face of objections which may be in many respects reasonable.

Equally serious difficulties may occur from the imprudence or mischievous disposition of persons to whom students naturally look up, when such persons criticise before them the conduct of instructors or administrators, or cultivate discontent with the regulations which may be in force. Agitations excited in this way are very detrimental to the individual student and to college work in general, while they impose an additional burden of vigilance and self-denial on officers, perhaps already overworked, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the effort, while meeting all reasonable demands, to avert revolutions which might have disastrous effects in the little world of college life.

Lastly, it should be taken for granted that very few students are radically evil-disposed, and that even these are amenable to higher influences, though there are, no doubt, cases in which it is better that a few corruptors of good should be sacrificed for the benefit of the majority. The instructor or administrator must bear in mind that he also serves a Master, and is in some sense the servant of all, and that "the Lord's servant must not strive, but be gentle toward all, apt to teach, forbearing, in meekness correcting those that oppose themselves." If by God's grace he can serve in this manner, the question of control is not likely to arise in any very acute form.

J. WILLIAM DAWSON,
Principal and Vice-Chancellor of McGill University.

THE control exercised over students may be of three kinds—over their choice of studies, over their attendance and preparation at college exercises, or over their general conduct. The conditions of universities, so-called, are so different that it will be better to give simply our general experience in the academic department of the University of California, and my deductions from that.

The entire university numbers 616 students, of whom 253 are in the professional schools located in San Francisco. The undergraduate department, of which I propose to speak particularly, is located at Berkeley, ten miles from San Francisco and five miles from Oakland, a city of 60,000 people. It numbers on its rolls 363 students (291 men and 72 women), the average age of entrance for all students being about nineteen years, the minimum being sixteen years. We have no dormitories, and after five o'clock in the afternoon our students are scattered to their homes and the campus is deserted, nearly one-half living in Oakland and San Francisco.

It is evident at once that some of these particulars simplify very much the problem of controlling the general conduct of the students. The presence of 20 per cent. of women and the scattering of the students after dark lessen very much the diffi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

culty of preserving order. Then the absence of any display of wealth among our students tends to general moderation and sobriety. Add to this systematic gymnasium training and an ample opportunity for field exercises, both of which form excellent safety-valves for superfluous animal spirits, and it will be seen why, without much control of general conduct, our students for the most part preserve excellent order.

In the matter of the choice of studies, our practice differs somewhat from most of the older colleges. We neither bind the student to the old-fashioned iron-clad curriculum, nor do we give him absolute freedom of choice in all respects. Our studies are arranged in eight grooves or courses, each leading to a definite form of education, each complete in itself. Of these eight courses five are scientific and three are literary. The scientific courses are in agriculture, mechanics, civil-engineering, mining, and chemistry. The literary courses are, first, in Greek and Latin; second, in Latin and English; third, in English literature and modern history and languages.

There are electives in all the courses, more in the later college years than in the earlier ones. There is a difference in the proportion of prescribed studies in the different courses also, the scientific courses having less election. Of course, where the studies lead to a definite end, like agriculture or mining, the choice of studies must be more limited. In point of difficulty the courses are intended to be as nearly equivalent to one another as possible, though, after all, some are much harder than others. Students desiring to pursue special courses may do so, if of mature years, by vote of the faculty. But in all cases, regular or special, the student must present a card showing a consistent and profitable course of study ranging through the years he expects to remain at the university, and this card must be approved by the faculty.

This dividing the studies into grooves, and requiring the student to select his groove, have been approved by experience, and the large body of students choose the regular courses. The advantage lies in this: The student at sixteen is unable to lay out his course of study, and even those of more mature years would be confused by the multiplicity of the studies and the conflict of the hours of recitation. But under our system he is only called on to choose his general pursuit, and then he finds the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

details laid out and the schedule of hours already arranged. If he is still desirous of deviating from the approved schedule, he may lay his plan of study before the faculty, who will generally accept it if it is thorough and consistent.

I believe, then, in the exercise of control over the student's choice of studies to the extent which we practice here. It is a golden mean between the old-fashioned rigid curriculum, and the other extreme where all is elective—a plan which calls on the students to shape their four years of study to a time when a considerable proportion of them are of immature years and unfit to make the choice; imposing upon them, moreover, the difficulties of reconciling the conflicting hours of different studies upon the schedule. And it prevents the lazy student from making up a course of "soft things" whereby he may pass through the four years of college life without any hard study.

In the matter of attendance and preparation at college exercises there is a wide difference of practice at various universities. I believe that, as our American colleges are constituted, the requirements should be quite strict. Many students come to college at the minimum age of sixteen, and, being fresh from the strict discipline of the high-school, too much liberty works to their harm. Some steady pressure is required to keep them up to their work; else they fall into habits of idleness and negligence. Then, too, many even of the older students are without any true thirst for learning. They entered college to please their parents, or to get the degree, or simply because it was the fashion, and they followed the example of their schoolmates. They have no real love of learning, nor do they feel the pressure of want—the need of an education to win a position in after life. There are many such, and they require some spur outside of themselves to keep them up to their work.

I would not advocate for such students the rigid system needed for young boys in the high-school or academy, but some control is required to maintain proper attendance and preparation. Regular attendance in the class-room is necessary, for, whether the instruction be by recitation or lecture, what transpires in the class-room is an important addition to the text-book, and should be listened to by the student. Moreover, in ascertaining whether the student is profiting by his college work, the examination at the end of the term is at best a poor way of finding out. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

daily recitation is a better test of the progress the student is making, and even when instruction is by lectures solely, mid-term or monthly off-hand examinations are more efficient. Cramming for a final examination, even if successful, is a poor substitute for daily term work.

Perhaps the same supervision is not required over the advanced classes, for by the time they reach that period the idlers have been largely weeded out, and the students who remain are older and have more sense of responsibility; but certainly our experience tells us that the younger classes require constant supervision. Another important reason is that the presence in a class of a considerable proportion of idlers drags down the standard of all the work and keeps back those who are competent and ambitious to press forward and do better.

To sum it all up: my observation and experience lead me to believe that in the under-graduate department of any college a careful control should be exercised over the student's choice of studies, and after that a steady supervision of his attendance and preparation of the college exercises, more especially during the early years of his course.

I have not spoken of the students engaged in post-graduate studies and professional schools (although they form a part of every true university), because they are more mature and usually undertake those studies as a preparation for their life-work. Their courses are marked out for them definitely, and very little control is generally exercised over their conduct or attendance.

In this paper I have spoken only of those parts of the university system with which I have come most in contact and where I have had most experience.

HORACE DAVIS,
President of the University of California.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AN ENGLISH VIEW OF THE CIVIL WAR.

II.

BY GENERAL VISCOUNT WOLSELEY, K. P., ADJUTANT-GENERAL OF THE BRITISH ARMY.

THE second volume of the "Battles and Leaders" is, in my judgment, even more interesting than the first volume. It introduces us to the period when General McClellan transformed the armed masses which had fought at the first battle of Bull Run, together with the vast numbers of recruits who subsequently joined them, into the Army of the Potomac. It takes us through the Peninsular Campaign and dwells upon the deeply-interesting questions involved in its conduct, as well as in its conception as illustrated by later events. It tells us of those two brilliant champions of a lost cause whose leadership is full of military suggestion and military lessons. No matter how doubtful at every point and for all time may have been the legality or advisability of the War, that two such men had fought on any one side would, of itself, throw a halo round the cause they fought for. Their character can never fail to excite general admiration. Even those who were most bitterly opposed to Stonewall Jackson and to Robert Lee, even those who believed them to be utterly wrong in their conception of national duty, will readily admit their excellence as soldiers, their sincerity as patriots.

There is so much to be said on the campaigns in the Shenandoah Valley, on the seven days' fighting near Richmond, on the campaign against Pope, and on Lee's invasion of Maryland, that I must pass over somewhat lightly the most important operations of Admiral Farragut, which led to the capture of New Orleans. Nevertheless, for us of the old country these "amphibious" operations, as Mr. Kinglake would call them, have a quite peculiar importance. The coöperation of the United States navy

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with their army, in producing a decisive effect upon the whole character of the military operations, is akin to what happens with us in nearly every war in which we engage. A German, a French, or a Russian general may frequently, perhaps usually, carry on a campaign without considering what assistance he may expect to derive from the coöperation of his own navy, or what impediments he may expect to encounter from the operations of the naval forces of his enemy. An English general has almost always to make his calculations strictly in accordance with what the navy can do for him. The operations by which the Federal navy, in conjunction with the army, split the Confederacy in two and severed the East from the West, must always, therefore, have for him a profound interest and importance. The great strategical results obtained by this concentration of military and naval power, which were as remarkable as the circumstances under which the successes were gained, deserve our closest study.

I shall not attempt to discuss from a naval point of view the much-debated question whether Admiral Porter's mortar-schooners were or were not largely instrumental in determining the success of Farragut's passage between Fort Jackson and Fort St. Philip. The point is, however, one in which the effect on the forts is as much involved as the action of the navy. I may, therefore, venture the opinion, based on the evidence of the Confederate side, that the bombardment, considering the enormous number of large shells actually exploded within Fort Jackson, had comparatively little effect in preventing that fort from contributing its share toward the result of the operation. Captain Robertson's evidence (p. 100, Vol. II.) is distinct that at the time of Admiral Farragut's passage, in the water-battery at least, "every gun in the battery was loaded and pointed toward the river, and the men were kept at their posts"; and again: "No guns were silenced in either Fort Jackson or the water-battery at any time during this engagement. Not a man was driven from his post at the guns in the water-battery, much less from the battery itself."

It is, *mutatis mutandis*, almost the same story that General Sheridan tells of the effect of the Prussian artillery at Gravelotte. There the Prussian officers believed they had absolutely silenced the French artillery and crushed out the resistance of the French infantry. From his experience during the Civil War, General Sheridan told them that when they made their attack they would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

find out their mistake. One of the most bloody repulses sustained by the Germans throughout the war soon afterwards verified the correctness of his inference.

Had it been necessary to silence by mortar fire the guns of Fort Jackson and the water-battery before the ships ran the gauntlet between Fort Jackson and Fort St. Philip, Farragut would never have achieved his splendid success. No! as always in war, Farragut's success was almost purely the result of the moral effect which his movement produced, and of defects other than material in the force opposed to him. It is clear that there was a complete want of unity of command over the combined naval and military defences for the protection of New Orleans. No doubt the Southern fleet was not properly ready for action, and for this unreadiness it would seem that Captain Mitchell, who commanded it, was not responsible. I do not think, however, it is possible to read the correspondence which passed between Captain Mitchell and General Duncan without feeling that Captain Mitchell was one of those men, common enough in every service, who cannot bring themselves to imagine that any one outside their own particular calling is other than a stupid fool. Such men usually conceive it to be their first duty to ignore, as an impertinent interference, any suggestion which comes from outside their own charmed circle. It is clear that the officers in the forts were in a position to observe the movements and to forecast the intentions of the Federals, and that the officers in the ships were not. As it turned out, the "Louisiana" proved absolutely useless to the defence. General Duncan saw through the intentions of Admiral Farragut, but his correct anticipation that the attempt would be made the night it was actually made was an absurd landsman's guess about matters he was not calculated to express any useful opinion upon. His views were, therefore, contemptuously ignored.

Had Captain Mitchell been a man large-minded enough to rise above paltry professional prejudices, he would not have continued to expend all his energies on preparing the "Louisiana" for a service she was never called upon to perform. But he would, on the other hand, have kept "the river well lit up with fire-rafts," as he was again and again urged to do. The temper shown in this proceeding is one so dangerous that, whenever it appears, it deserves to be castigated by those who review the facts afterwards,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whether the lash falls on naval or military shoulders. The same temper, it would seem, crops out in Commodore Mitchell's present defence. "Naval officers," he says, "ought surely to be considered better judges of how the forces and appliances at their command should be managed than army officers." Certainly no one will dispute that statement, but both naval and army officers must be judged by a reasonable examination of the results of their action and of the alternatives open to them. On the question whether certain naval officers properly coöperated with and paid proper attention to the representations of the soldiers, a Naval Court of Inquiry is not likely to be the most impartial of tribunals. It would have been interesting if, in appealing to the final judgment of history, Commodore Mitchell had not relied merely upon a naval verdict, which, as he admits, was given without any reception of the evidence on the other side. It would have been well for him to explain why no fire-ships were sent down the river; why the forts were left to fight in the dark during the actual night of attack. Granting that he is correct in urging that by the evening of the 24th April he would have had his ships ready, it would be interesting to know what service he considered he was rendering the Confederacy by preparations which, it was pointed out to him, could not be completed in time for the attack that others believed would be made on the night it actually occurred. To weigh fairly the evidence and to estimate justly the soundness or unsoundness of the reasons and motives which determined Commodore Mitchell's action at the time, it is not necessary to be either a soldier or a sailor. When that officer alleged that he did not take steps to meet the attack on the night between April 23 and 24, because the "Louisiana" would be ready for service by the evening of the 24th, any man of ordinary common-sense will understand that he disbelieved the evidence supplied to him. The evidence went to show that the attack would be made twenty-four hours before the evening of the 24th. Yet surely those reasons for expecting the attack to be made when it did actually come off were absolutely sound.

Such, I think, will be the verdict of independent naval officers, who examine the facts without prejudice. I would sooner have exposed such a line of conduct on the part of a soldier, because my views upon it would then have been more manifestly impartial. But I feel it is important, in the interest of all naval

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and military states, that these miserable little professional prejudices should be exposed wherever and whenever they occur, for the encouragement of the large-minded men of both services. To do so frankly at all times will, I think, check one of the most fatal tendencies by which the success of any joint naval and military operations may be imperilled, as, in my opinion, the interests of the Confederacy were seriously injured in this instance. To me it seems clear that Admiral Farragut's splendid achievement was made possible, first, by the inadequate previous preparation of the naval part of the New Orleans defences; secondly, by the want of harmonious working between the Confederate naval and military forces; and, lastly, by his own clear appreciation of the moral effect he would produce by forcing his way past the defences of Fort Jackson and Fort St. Philip and by his appearance before New Orleans. For, after all, the forts were never captured by actual attack. They fell because the Confederate soldiers in Fort Jackson mutinied against the continuance of the defence when New Orleans had been captured. It is a curious fact to note that, at that very time, New Orleans—which, however, could not itself be defended—was surrendering avowedly because those forts had fallen! This brilliant result is a striking instance of the due appreciation by a commander of the effect which daring achievements exert on men's minds, although, as in this case, those daring acts do not actually, directly, or materially make certain the end or the surrender they may have secured. In other words, Admiral Farragut's attack was based on a knowledge of the superior importance in war of moral over material force. One can hardly offer a higher compliment to any naval or military commander.

I pass now to the appointment of General McClellan to the command of the Army of the Potomac, and his subsequent accession, for a time at least, to the general command of the armies of the United States. I entertain the strongest possible belief, which has been confirmed by all the evidence supplied by the *Century* papers, that for the failure of the Peninsular Campaign the Administration at Washington was far more to blame than General McClellan. It is, therefore, only fair that I should turn first to the defence of the Administration which has been attempted by Lieutenant-Colonel R. B. Irwin (p. 435, Vol. II.), and examine it in the light of the evidence supplied elsewhere.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General McClellan was appointed on July 25, 1861, to the command of the army in the department of the Potomac, and on November 1 following "to command the whole army" of the United States. He had to create out of purely raw materials an army of which the part he proposed to employ in the Peninsula alone was 156,000 strong. The more one studies the nature of this force as it manœuvred and fought in the Peninsula, and as, despite all its subsequent disasters, it substantially remained throughout the War, the more marvellous does the ability, as well as the rapidity, with which General McClellan organized it appear to soldiers who understand the magnitude and difficulty of the task he undertook. Throughout his whole army, with few exceptions, this appears to have been the view taken by all, from the most senior general to the youngest recruit. But outside the army this was different, although in newspaper articles he was commonly referred to, with more effusion than sense, as the young American Napoleon. They did not hesitate to puff this untried leader as they would have advertised the talents of some rising dentist. As time wore on without bringing any decisive action, there arose throughout the mass of the people an impatience at the delay of preparation, which became daily more apparent. That most cruel tyrant, the "public," had no means of realizing the difficulties to be overcome. It did not understand what organization meant, but it shared with all peoples the very common article of faith that you have only to gather together hundreds of thousands of men, and to arm them, in order to form an army.

As the months of 1862 went by, the universal feeling was one of impatience and restlessness at what was deemed the waste of time and the useless delay which were taking place. Under that impression, and under the force which this so formed Public Opinion was exerting, the Administration at Washington found itself compelled to act. That is evident enough from the most interesting and striking letters which Colonel Irwin quotes as written by Mr. Lincoln to McClellan. It is clear in all of them that the President felt he was being driven by a power superior to his own, and by one to which McClellan, like himself, must yield. "Once more let us tell you," he writes, "it is indispensable to *you* that you strike a blow! I am powerless to help this." The Administration was merely giving expression to the decrees of an

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

entirely ignorant public opinion. If all those who wield the pen would only kindly wait until commanders have quite accomplished the mission entrusted to them before they decide that soldiers, "with their guns and drums and fuss and fury," are to pass away and leave the glory to others, it might matter little to the state. But when in the middle of a war they take it upon themselves to drive or to force those whom they influence to decide what the naval or military commander should do, the result will certainly be, as it was in this instance, to protract, perhaps for years, the duration of the war which they, in their self-conceit, imagined they could settle off-hand at once.

If these *Century* articles could be as widely read among us as they have been in America, we might possibly be saved in the future from disasters such as were entailed on us in the Crimea by very similar action. In particular, I should like those articles by Mr. Warren Lee Goss, the "Recollections of a Private," duly studied. For, after all, questions of strategy, of tactics, and of the importance of organization of all kinds turn upon the effect which is ultimately produced on the spirit and well-being and fighting efficiency of the private soldier. Whilst the organs of public opinion and their humble servant, the public Administration, were grumbling at the slow movements which only carried General McClellan's army forward fifty-two miles in sixteen days (Colonel Irwin, p. 437), Private Lee Goss and his companions were learning "in time that marching on paper and the actual march made two very different impressions," and though they could "easily understand and excuse our fireside heroes, who fought their own or our battles at home over comfortable breakfast-tables, without impediments of any kind to circumscribe their fancied operations," they found out also that it is "much easier to manœuvre and fight large armies around the corner grocery than to fight, march, and manœuvre in wind and rain, in the face of a brave and vigilant enemy."

There are, however, matters beyond the immediate view of the private which must be considered. From the moment when, thanks to those mistakes of Mr. Jefferson Davis of which I spoke in the last article, the Federal navy had asserted its absolute supremacy at sea, it is clear that the shortest and safest, as well as the most decisive, route to Richmond was by a movement based on the James River. To carry this out arrangements for the ade-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quate protection of Washington were essential. But whilst McClellan with the main army marched upon Richmond, it was necessary to protect the force allotted for the defence of Washington from a counter-stroke by Lee or by his lieutenant, Stonewall Jackson. To effect this it was desirable to keep it close to Washington, and thus as far away from Richmond as was possible with due regard to the safety of the former city. In order that the army on the James River, intended for offensive operations, should be made as strong as possible, the force detailed for the protection of Washington should have been as small as was consistent with the accomplishment of its object, and should have had a strictly defensive rôle allotted to it. This concentration of energy on a single aim at a time is such a commonplace of ordinary business life that it is passing strange why it should be so difficult to persuade men who have not had the experience of war that in all military operations it is the one thing most needful. Military history, had it been known to Mr. Lincoln and his ministers, would have taught them that, under the then existing circumstances, the Confederate army could not venture far away from Richmond. That threatened capital was not only the seat of the Confederate government, but it was also the base from which the Confederate armies between Richmond and Washington drew their supplies. Whenever attacked, those armies must have returned to defend it.

I think General McClellan ought not to have left Washington without convincing himself that Mr. Lincoln and the Secretary of War were satisfied with the arrrangements he had made for the defence of the capital. That those arrangements were in themselves adequate is beyond doubt. In omitting to come to this understanding with the President, he evinced, it would seem, a want of knowledge of the working of popular governments in times of great national danger. He thus exposed himself to, or, at least, he gave an excuse for, the very thing which happened—that which ruined his chances in the campaign; namely, the withdrawal from his command of at least 63,000 men. Nor was this mere withdrawal of McDowell's corps, of Blenker's division, and of the 10,000 men of General Wool's command, the only disastrous consequence which was entailed on McClellan by the exaggerated fears of the Government at Washington. Secretary Stanton appears to have been encouraged by this first interference

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with McClellan's plans to take upon himself the general direction of the whole campaign. It was he who thrust forward the force under McDowell, and so entailed upon McClellan the necessity of placing himself in that false position astride of the Chickahominy which led to all the misfortunes of this campaign. It is scarcely possible to imagine any military arrangements more futile than those which were devised by this civilian Minister of War, Mr. Stanton. His scattering of the Federal forces throughout the Shenandoah Valley gave Jackson the opportunity for carrying out his brilliant campaign in that region. The necessity of maintaining connection with the armies which were to come to his support from the North obliged McClellan so to divide his force that, had General J. E. Johnston's orders been properly carried out, the Federal army ought to have had its left wing annihilated at the battle of Seven Pines, as it actually had its right wing crushed at Gaines's Mill.

As already stated, I think General McClellan should have satisfied Mr. Lincoln as to the steps he had taken for the defence of Washington, because that was a subject on which the President had fairly every right to be satisfied; but I cannot admit that this omission on the General's part was any adequate excuse for the complete upsetting of his whole plan of campaign. Mr. Lincoln, though doubtless one of the greatest men who have ruled the United States, was entirely ignorant of war. Able and wise as he was in all matters of civil government, he failed here most disastrously. By the course he pursued he wrecked an ably-devised plan for the advance upon Richmond of all the available Federal forces by one single line, whilst the troops intended for the defence of Washington were kept as passive as possible. Instead of that plan, a divided command was inaugurated and a disjointed series of movements were ordered, which ended in the transfer of the initiative to Lee. The change ordered by Mr. Lincoln in McClellan's plans gave the Confederates an opportunity for throwing their united forces, at pleasure, upon any part of the scattered Federal army. I cannot admit, as Colonel Irwin appears to expect we should all at once do, that McClellan was wrong in refusing to explain publicly to the Cabinet the details of his proposed scheme. At that time it was notorious that what was said to the Cabinet in Washington leaked out at once into the streets, and was thence conveyed promptly to the Confederate authorities. I know, from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

what I learned at Richmond in the autumn of 1862, how well Lee was kept informed of everything done or intended by the Northern army.

Let us hear Stonewall Jackson on this subject, and compare his methods and principles of action in each particular with those that were pressed on McClellan by the Washington Administration, or, rather, by their master, public opinion. We have to thank General Imboden for those golden sentences of Jackson's which comprise some of the most essential of all the principles of war:

"Always mystify, mislead, and surprise the enemy, if possible; and when you strike and overcome him, never let up in the pursuit so long as your men have strength to follow; for an army routed, if hotly pursued, becomes panic-stricken, and can then be destroyed by half their number. The other rule is, never fight against heavy odds, if by any possible manœuvring you can hurl your own force on only a part, and that the weakest part, of your enemy and crush it. Such tactics will win every time, and a small army may thus destroy a large one in detail, and repeated victory will make it invincible."

Compare those principles, and the mode in which Jackson carried them out, with the ideas current at Washington, and you will see that they are direct inversions. The orders which emanated from there may be described thus:

"Go straight at the enemy at the very point where he expects you, and where he has long been expecting to receive you. Let every one know what you are going to do, so that we may announce it in the public press, and chuckle and crow over your coming victory. Scatter your forces in as many directions as possible, so that the enemy may always be able to bring superior forces against you. Arrange your force so that it is rigidly tied to one particular point, and that the enemy cannot doubt where you will be. Go ahead without preparation, forethought, or care; only let us hear that you are moving, so that the newspapers may brag."

These—I declare I have nothing exaggerated and naught set down in malice—these are the principles and practice which Colonel Irwin has undertaken the task of defending. It is a difficult one. I frankly admit that, when dealing with this fatuous folly, General McClellan did not behave with the meekness of an amiable schoolboy under discipline. I think he was unjust to Mr. Stanton in supposing that he (Mr. Stanton) had any personal hostility to him. Mr. Stanton really believed that the orders he gave were transparently sound and wise, and that any one who differed from him must be wrong. I do not know, however, that, placed in General McClellan's position, most generals could possibly have realized this. In order to understand Mr. Stanton it is necessary to read General Pope's account of his interview with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that gentleman, given on page 449. One of my friends assures me that in reading it he literally "laughed till he cried," and never fully understood what the expression meant before doing so. I can quite understand it. Laughter is said to be due to our being impelled by two contradictory feelings at the same time. That certainly is the condition under which one reads those pages. There is scarcely any folly possible in relation to the command of an army which Mr. Stanton does not propose with the gravest face to General McDowell. At the same time, the man is evidently sincere, and convinced that, being a clever politician and holding the position of War Minister, every principle of war—*as he understood war*—which he enunciated must be right, and therefore ought to be obeyed without question. It is difficult to pronounce whether the image that rises before us is that of the ignorant stage charlatan who, because his legs are decked with military boots, thinks himself every inch a soldier, or that of a grave Minister who is charged with the solemn responsibility of a great Nation's destiny and with the lives and fortunes of thousands of his fellow-citizens. Let me put a few of the points together.

If there be one thing more important than another in the command of any army, but more especially of one recently gathered together in a hurry from civil life, it is that officers and men should have confidence in their leader. It is essential that they should know and understand him, and, from their previous experience, should feel sure he is going to lead them to victory. "Therefore," says Mr. Stanton, "I cannot be wrong in withdrawing General Pope from the Army of the Mississippi, where he is known and liked and has been doing very well, to take command of the army of Virginia, where no one knows much more than his name, his previous military operations not having been on a scale to command universal attention."

Promotion of a junior over the heads of men very senior to him in the service is often very wise and necessary; but unless it is done for reasons which are known and appreciated by the army as a whole, such as tend to inspire the army with confidence, it is pretty sure to lead to serious friction. "Therefore," says Mr. Stanton, "let us proceed as follows: There are those three corps, which have been chiefly formed under McClellan and are extremely proud of themselves as forming part of the old Army of the Potomac. They have already begun to acquire a certain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spirit of their own; disasters have overtaken them for the moment (in consequence, as they believed, of their having been withdrawn from McClellan and foolishly scattered). Let us, therefore, select an officer from a far-off region, belonging to a force of which the Army of the Potomac has a certain amount of soldierly jealousy. . The deeds of that distant hero will certainly not be appreciated at their full value by the followers of McClellan. But never mind; let us put this unknown leader over the heads of the three men now holding high command in that army, each well known to his own corps, and each senior to the man we select to command them." With disadvantages of such a nature against him, it may still be necessary sometimes to put an able junior over his seniors, in order that he should undertake some special task, provided he clearly sees his way to accomplish it, and feels confidence in himself. "Therefore," said Mr. Stanton, "let us select General Pope to undertake a task which he himself regards as a 'forlorn hope.' Despite his imploring remonstrances that he may be sent back to his old army, we will order him to 'submit cheerfully,' which will, of course, inspire him with all the confidence he needs." Surely, surely, so far at least every man who manages a large business concern will follow me in seeing that all these propositions denote an insanity that would be ludicrous, if it were not, in such a matter, so terribly criminal.

Upon General Pope, not a strong commander, was now forced the monstrous scheme of moving forward his already hopelessly-scattered army to "demonstrate" within striking distance of Richmond just at the time when McClellan, deprived of that very force, was about to be reduced to inaction by the battle of Gaines's Mill and the retreat to the James River at this junction. General Pope showed his appreciation of the position by urging the appointment of some one general to command the two armies, who could then combine their action for a common purpose. It was a necessity entailed by the attempts to operate at once with both armies, instead of keeping one of them on the defensive and weakened so as to make the other very strong for rapid, offensive operations along the most telling line for an advance. It is obvious that the retreat of McClellan to the James River did make General Pope's position, to the north of Richmond, exceptionally dangerous. It placed the Confederate army absolutely between the two Federal armies, and greatly increased the distance be-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tween them. It is not, however, I think, the fact, as General Pope assumes, that the Confederates were "ready to exchange Richmond for Washington." For Jackson's movement to oppose Pope was not made till Lee was convinced that McClellan's army was not in a condition to carry out any further offensive movement. The wide turning movement of Jackson on Manassas Junction, and the movement northwards of Longstreet's corps, did not take place till McClellan had begun to evacuate the Peninsula.

Whatever mistakes General Pope may have made, it is clear that the disasters of this campaign were due to the order from Washington which required him to maintain an advanced position on the Rappahannock, and which gave him reason to suppose that his communications with Manassas would be guarded by troops independent of his own army, but which were nowhere within reach when they were wanted. For that failure General Halleck was no doubt directly responsible; but the great mistake lay in that action of the Administration, which can hardly be better described than in Mr. Lincoln's words applied later in the War: they "swopped horses whilst they were crossing the stream." They allowed McClellan to go off with his army to the Peninsula whilst he was at least nominally in command of the armies of the United States, and as soon as he was fully committed to the enterprise, they so completely upset all his arrangements as to bring about the condition of things which made it necessary to have with the Government in Washington a "General-in-Chief" of all the National forces. General Halleck was selected for the post—a most unhappy, most unfortunate selection.

I do not much appreciate any part of General Halleck's conduct in the War, either when he was in the West or after he arrived at Washington. He appears to have chiefly distinguished himself in the West by snubbing the two ablest soldiers he had under him, Generals Grant and Sherman. He appears to have chiefly distinguished himself at Washington by first snubbing General McClellan, then by placing Pope in a hopeless position, then, immediately after, by giving a positive assurance that Pope was in no danger, to be followed quickly by a complete loss of heart when that General's army came hurrying back in confusion to the Potomac. Then we find him, when panic-stricken for the safety of Washington, throw all responsibility on McClellan, the man he had previously snubbed. As soon as McClellan's presence

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had restored confidence and *morale* to Pope's demoralized army, he does his best to prevent McClellan from striking effective blows against the very much weaker and, for the time, necessarily dispersed army of General Lee, and we see him, ignorantly and stupidly, incidentally throwing away the forces which were compelled to surrender at Harper's Ferry. It is not, therefore, from any special sympathy with General Halleck that I am induced to think he was, from the first, placed in a false position. He had to take up and accept for better or worse the fatuous plan devised by Secretary Stanton, against which both McClellan and Pope had equally protested. He had to face immediate emergencies before he could possibly have made himself really acquainted with all the circumstances of the new field of war into which he had been suddenly pitchforked.

Hence my own conviction that for this, as for most of the other misfortunes experienced by the Federal troops, the verdict of history will ultimately hold responsible the Administration at Washington rather than the generals who commanded in the field. And yet it is both striking and interesting to see how much the personal character of Lincoln himself rose superior to his surroundings. His very modesty unfortunately left him, as regards all military operations, too much in the hands of his Secretary for War. But compare Mr. Stanton, with "large eye-glasses," "dishevelled appearance," "presence not imposing," "abrupt manner," "speech short and rather dictatorial," employed in dictating orders which were rank nonsense, with the quiet, modest manner, the simple, natural dignity, the genial humor, the shrewd common-sense, which appear in every story told of President Lincoln. One sees clearly enough that, though General McClellan was probably wrong as to the cause which he assigned for Mr. Stanton's opposition to him, he was right enough in attributing his difficulties to the Secretary for War, and not to the President. Mr. Lincoln was, from a military point of view, clearly mistaken in believing that *the* one way to get at Richmond was by making straight there from Washington. It is impossible, however, if one puts one's self at all in his place, not to see how nobly he faced the difficulties of his position, and how anxiously he endeavored to do his duty to his country.

WOLSELEY.

[TO BE CONTINUED.]

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE TELEGRAPH MONOPOLY.

BY PROFESSOR RICHARD T. ELY, OF JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

THERE was something ludicrous in the surprise and consternation expressed by the general public when it became known that the Western Union Telegraph Company had acquired the lines of the Baltimore and Ohio. It was manifestly a hard, and at the time it seemed almost a shattering, blow to those who worship the idol of "private competition" as a sufficient power to save us from all industrial evils. Yet nothing was more groundless than the expectation that the temporary competition between these two powerful rivals could have any other termination than that which we have witnessed, for the telegraph business is, in its very nature, a monopoly. Experience and reason alike teach that combination between rival telegraph lines can be predicted almost with the certainty of a coming eclipse. Fifty years ago a clear-headed merchant-prince of England uttered this famous dictum: "Where combination is possible competition is impossible."

Two years ago Professor Henry C. Adams demonstrated, in his monograph, "The Relation of the State to Industrial Action," the impossibility of competition in a business like the telegraph service, and in July, 1887, at Chautauqua, when the telegraph officials were protesting that there was no thought in their minds of combination, I used these words in a public address, basing what I said, not upon any special knowledge of the affairs of the two great companies, but on scientific principles:

"One telegraph company can send telegrams all over the country cheaper than two; hence the absorption of all companies, save the Baltimore and Ohio, by the Western Union.* It is so in the nature of things that I do not see how the Baltimore and Ohio can permanently resist the economic gravitation which draws it to its rival."

* I left out of consideration, as not worthy of special notice, certain minor attempts at competition.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

As it is of the first importance, in a discussion of the telegraph question, to grasp the fact that monopoly is inevitable, it is well to give a little space to an interrogation of past experience and of reason. First, it must be noticed that, while telegraph lines extend over the entire globe and while this industry is forty years old, the world has yet to see one single example of permanent successful competition. Over thirty companies were chartered in England, but it was never possible to secure more than temporary competition, and the attempt to secure competition was finally abandoned as impracticable and unsatisfactory. There were over fifty companies in the United States in 1851, but the most important consolidated in the same year, and combination has ever since been the end of attempted competition.

Of course, there must be some grounds in the nature of things for this, and these are, in fact, sufficiently evident on reflection. Telegraph companies always consolidate because one company can do all the business much more cheaply than two or more: consequently all derive a profit from combination. The struggle or warfare which precedes this is merely to determine the terms on which the two will unite. Strictly speaking, it is not competition at all, for competition is not a war of extinction, but a constant, permanent pressure. Why do not all the great dry-goods houses in New York combine? Why did not the late A. T. Stewart consolidate his business with that of Lord & Taylor and of Arnold & Constable? Because it was not to their manifest advantage; but it is always in the interest of natural monopolies to unite.

Mr. Farrer, in his work, "The State in its Relation to Trade," gives the following characteristics of natural monopolies, which will help to render this clearer:

"*First*—What they supply is necessary.

"*Second*—They occupy peculiarly favored spots or lines of land.

"*Third*—The article or convenience they supply is used at the place where and in connection with the plant or machinery by which it is supplied.

"*Fourth*—This article or convenience can, in general, be largely, if not indefinitely, increased without proportionate increase in plant and capital.

"*Fifth*—Certainty and harmonious arrangement, which can only be attained by unity, are paramount considerations."

We see, then, that there is a certain class of pursuits for which there is no escape from monopoly. Without attempting an enumeration of them, I will remark that gas- and water-works are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

local monopolies and are for a municipality what telegraphs are for a nation; and the good people of Baltimore had scarcely recovered from the shock which the absorption of the Baltimore and Ohio Telegraph caused them before they were again startled by the consolidation of their two gas companies and an increase of 200 per cent. in price. Had they understood the fundamental principles of industrial science, they would not have allowed their streets to be torn up time and time again in their fruitless attempts to grasp such a Utopia as competition in the gas supply.

We consequently see that we have a choice between two alternatives, and there is no middle ground between them. These are (a) private monopoly and (b) public monopoly; and the desirability of each will be considered in the order named.

Private monopolies are contrary alike to the spirit of English law and American institutions, and must be pronounced odious. There is no place for them among a liberty-loving people, and the attempt to reconcile us to them is as difficult as to fit a square pin into a round hole. One thing has been decided beyond all doubt: private monopolies cannot be left unregulated and uncontrolled. The attempt to do that has been definitely abandoned in the United States; but it cannot be said that regulation and control have worked satisfactorily. Regulation and control mean interference of government in private affairs—a bad thing, complicating government and opening the flood-gates of corruption. Private monopolies are, at this moment, the cause of that perpetual interference of the government which we witness all about us, and are the most fruitful cause of corruption in public life; incomparably more so than the government management and ownership of public business. To deny this seems to me simply a confession of profound ignorance of what is passing about us and among us daily. A bill is brought into the legislature to regulate the price of gas supplied by a private company, and this at once brings about a conflict between the public interest and a powerful private interest. It involves, in its very nature, a strong and often irresistible temptation to bribery and corruption, and that in two ways. On the one hand, monopolies attempt to prevent unjust legislation by abundant use of money, and, indirectly, by the bestowal of special favors and privileges, such as passes on railways, opportunities to buy stock or presents of stock, freight rebates, telegraph franks given to members of Congress, and so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forth. On the other hand, unscrupulous legislators bring in bills attacking corporations, purposely to be bought off, so that otherwise upright men are almost forced to use money improperly to protect themselves and those whom they represent. Between the two currents political life becomes demoralized, as is well known, and the chief cause is the private monopoly. Corruption inheres in its very nature, in its very essence. It is a bad thing and must remain such. Why dwell on this? Does not one of the most powerful, and in some respects one of the most admirable, corporations of the United States maintain, as a regular part of its business, a corruption bureau to manipulate and purchase legislatures? Do not street-car and gas companies perpetually interfere in politics? Is there not a prominent city in our West in which both Republican and Democratic members of the council are nominated by a private street-car company? Do not lobbies supported by corporations steal bills from House and Senate files? After a bill regulating the price of gas had been stolen from the Senate files in Maryland, was it not necessary for Governor Jackson to go the State House and watch a new bill pass with his own eyes and sign it then and there, lest it should be stolen?

The public monopoly is at any rate the lesser of the two evils. Doubtless that is not an ideal thing; doubtless we shall not for a long time find perfection. What we want is simplification in public business, and this is promoted every time a private monopoly is abolished by the substitution of a public monopoly. How simple the post-office business! How few opportunities, comparatively, it offers for fraud! How complex, how intricate, how passing ordinary understanding, the relations between our governments and our railway corporations!

It is on account of these reasons that I desire government monopoly of the telegraph business, and I will at once state why it is desirable that a government should purchase existing lines rather than compete with other lines, in particular with the Western Union.

First, the competition by the government with existing lines would increase the expense of the telegraph service, and would thus occasion a loss which would be by no means counterbalanced by the fact that lines could be constructed more cheaply than purchased. The private companies would make a fight for business between great centres, and would take away some of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most profitable business, while they would leave all the poor business for the government lines. This would necessitate higher rates than would be requisite under a public monopoly. Why can government carry a letter three thousand miles for two cents? Because it has a monopoly. Again, any private company would certainly resort to corrupt measures either to ward off government competition or to moderate it. Can any one fail to see the hand of private express companies in many of our post-office laws and regulations? Why does our Federal Government send newspapers for publishers for a cent a pound and require sixteen cents a pound for merchandise? Why does it add to excessive charges for that business which competes with express companies, annoying and absurd regulations? Such things are unknown where powerful express companies do not exist.

Competition between government enterprise and private enterprise has been tried in the railway business in Germany and elsewhere, but has not been satisfactory, and has generally been abandoned.

Some cry "paternalism" when government telegraphy is mentioned. This word "paternalism" has become a prize bogey with which to frighten the unthinking. The state is not something above us, doing something for us. It is one kind of coöperation. It shows greater self-reliance to provide a telegraph service for ourselves than to say that "we are so dishonest and inefficient in government methods that we dare not trust ourselves. Will not some rich men kindly provide us with a good telegraph system, and please give us cheap rates?" It has always seemed to me that those who call government enterprise "paternalism" have never become real Americans. It is beginning to be seen that such designation is unscientific. The English economist, Professor Sidgwick, of Cambridge, styles public enterprises like the telegraph and municipal gas-works an extension of the principle of individualism, and not socialism at all.

It is, however, urged that public ownership of telegraphs is a step towards socialism. Why does not government bake bread for us as well as send telegrams? Questions like this are asked. Manifestly the two functions are not analogous. The one is a natural monopoly; the other not. The tendency to absorb natural monopolies shows no tendency to absorb all business.

We live in a time of expanding industry, and government

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

business has grown, as has all other business; but there is no cause for alarm. While there has been an absolute growth in government business, such statistics as we have tend to show that, as compared with the amount of private business, there has been a relative decrease.

Another false alarm has been raised by the cry "centralization." The truth is, we are apparently living in a time of relative decentralization. During the last sixty years in Ohio, the expenses of the local political units, such as county, city, school district, have increased far more than twice as rapidly as those of the State; and investigation in the countries of Europe, as well as in the American States, shows very generally that during the past thirty or forty years local expenses have increased twice as rapidly as those of the central State governments. Now, as expenses are a tolerably fair measure of functions, we can safely say that local business increases faster than central State business; and that we live in a time when government is not extending its business as rapidly as private persons, and when the business of central governments is not increasing so rapidly as the business of local governments.

One other objection is increased political "patronage." In itself, "patronage" for members of legislatures is not a good thing, but in the purchase of the telegraph, rather than in attempted control of it, the removal of opportunities for fraud and oppression and the simplification of government business would more than counterbalance the evils of increased patronage. Secondly, patronage can be remedied by better civil-service rules, and the very increase in the civil-service staff would strengthen existing civil-service rules and would force the importance of civil-service reform upon the attention of the country. Thirdly, the telegraph business would be combined with the post-office business, and as in many offices the same man could attend to both, there would not be so large an increase in government employees as one would at first imagine. The number of Presidential appointments would increase only slightly, and the number of post-offices brought under the civil-service rules as they exist even now would be increased, because many more offices would have the necessary number of employees. Fourthly, as the business of government increases, there is, in modern times, a constant tendency to improvement, and this tendency is so marked that few exceptions

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to it can be adduced. Why was civil-service reform introduced into the United States? Precisely on account of the growing importance of government business, and on this very account civil-service regulations were introduced in Philadelphia.

One reason why our government has been so poor is the indifference of upright men of intelligence and means; but this tends to disappear as they realize the importance of government. When government really amounts to something, it offers a career to men of talent. On all these accounts there has been a remarkable improvement in the art of government throughout the civilized world during the past twenty years. I believe no assertion is safer than the prediction that the purchase of telegraph lines would improve our civil service immediately, and soon lead to measures which would diminish the "patronage" of elected office holders, such as Senators, Representatives, President. I think also that the wire-pullers appreciate this. There is not one of the worse class of "spoils" politicians who does not oppose an extension of the business of government. The shrewdest of them must see that to make government an important business agency will mean death to "practical politics."

In conclusion, we must ask the testimony of experience, and this in all countries where a government telegraph has been tried is unanimous in favor of public telegraph service. In none of these countries would the people even consider the subject of replacing public telegraphs by private telegraphs, and everywhere the experience of the United States is regarded as a warning against private telegraph companies. England's experience is instructive. Private companies were there tried until they proved to be intolerable; then they were purchased. Elsewhere in Europe the telegraph was from the start a public institution, and this is the result: while the estimated cost of telegraphs in all other States of Europe is 282,000,000 francs, the estimated cost to England of her telegraphs is 272,000,000 francs; in other words, owing to unsuccessful attempts to secure a good private telegraph system, England paid nearly as much for her telegraphs as all the other countries in Europe put together.

The following statistics show the increased facilities offered the public and the resulting increase of business. In 1868 private lines connected about 1,000 cities. In 1870 the telegraph became a state institution; in 1882 there were 5,595 telegraph stations, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in 1888, 6,810. The telegrams forwarded in 1868 numbered six millions; in 1882, 31,500,000; in 1888, 53,403,425. It is said that technical improvements have not recently been introduced in England, but this is false. While American telegraphs are resisting improvements, and, according to uncontradicted newspaper reports, are buying important inventions of Edison and locking them up lest they should benefit any one, the English telegraph has made wonderful progress. In an address before the British Association for the Advancement of Science, at the meeting held in Bath, 1888, Mr. W. H. Preece, the best authority in England on the subject, said: "The telegraphic system of England has been brought to the highest pitch of perfection." He mentions also the fact that American newspapers chronicled it as a "big thing" when 500,000 words were sent by our telegraphic system over the wires in one night at the time of the last Republican Convention in Chicago, when President Harrison was nominated; whereas the English telegraph sent 1,500,000 words from the central telegraph office in London in one night, when Mr. Gladstone introduced his Home-Rule Bill on April 8, 1886. Moreover, we can judge our telegraphic managers "out of their own mouth." They declare themselves incompetent to place their wires underground, whereas of 1,745 lines of wire entering the central station in London not one is open, and some wires extend underground for distances from twelve to twenty-two miles from that office.

The government telegraphs of Europe have made rapid strides in improvements, and much progress has been due to the *Journal Télégraphique*, the organ of the international union of government telegraphs. On the whole, in the way of supplying conveniences, forming international combinations, and in leading in cheap rates, government telegraphs have done far more than private lines, and their service to-day is for the ordinary private individual—one is almost tempted to say—incomparably better. Quite as much inducement for improvement is offered as in private telegraphy—in fact, even more. First, each state takes a pride in establishing low rates, and so there is a kind of international competition. Secondly, each man at the head of the telegraph service wants to make a better showing than others. The people call for low rates and bring pressure to bear, and at the same time the administration dreads to apply to the public

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

treasury to make good a deficiency; thus the officials must be alert and active. The public demand for good and efficient service is more powerful with a public telegraph than with a private company.

The experience of both England and the United States shows that a few great centres are tolerably well served by private companies, but other places miserably. A few years ago I wanted to send a telegram of importance from Richmond, Virginia, early on Monday morning, but the telegraph office was locked until seven o'clock in the morning. This could have happened, I believe, in no city of seventy five thousand inhabitants in western Europe. During the summer of 1887 I sent a telegram from Baltimore to Fredonia, in New York State (about forty miles from Buffalo), on Saturday; on Sunday, I sent a second—both of great importance; and on Sunday, receiving no answer to either, started for Fredonia, to arrive on the same day on which the telegrams came —namely, Monday. That could scarcely have happened in any country in western Europe; and it is to be noticed that post-offices with us offer better facilities than telegraph offices, for even in small places they are open at least once on Sunday, although there is less call for it. These concrete illustrations are given because they are merely typical. As to poor quality of service as seen in frequent mistakes, it is needless to speak. Every one knows that.

There has been an attempt to make it appear that prices are low in this country, but this results either from ignorance or from willful intent to deceive. They are as high as they profitably can be. It is ridiculous to compare the charge for telegraphing a mile here and a mile in Europe, because the cost of service is not greatly influenced by distance. Some claim that it is not at all influenced thereby, while others even maintain that, on an average, the actual outlay for a domestic telegram to a remote part of the country is less than to a nearer point. This is going too far, but without entering into technical details, it can readily be seen on reflection that a great part of the labor and expense of sending a domestic telegram is absolutely independent of distance. This matter of distance is so subordinate that all European countries except Russia and Turkey neglect it altogether, and have one uniform price for all domestic telegrams, as for letters. The average price in the United States should be compared with this.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Let us place the average price in the United States at fifty cents, and as it is so much more to many distant points, it will be conceded that sufficient allowance has been made for the legitimate added cost of long distances and sparsely-settled districts. If, then, this average charge, with due allowance for great distances, is fifty cents for ten words in the United States, we have a basis for comparison.

England charges twelve cents for twelve words; Germany, seventeen cents for ten words, and deducts a cent and a quarter for every word less than ten; Belgium, nine cents for ten words; Italy, eighteen cents for fifteen words; Switzerland, ten cents for ten words. It will be perceived that the charges for telegrams are higher in the United States than elsewhere. On the other hand, letters are actually carried, and notwithstanding long distances our government sends letters as cheaply as any country and more cheaply than some countries.

Many of these countries, it should be further remembered, derive a net revenue from the telegraph, which enables them to lessen taxation by so much. The English telegraph has not yielded net revenue because the policy of England has been to reduce rates and improve service rather than to seek profits. It now about pays expenses, and if the recent rapid increase of revenue continues, the English telegraph will also soon yield net revenue to the public treasury.

It has been urged that a private telegraph company is responsible for errors, but business men say that this nominal legal responsibility is actually a farce. Moreover, government can, if it is desired, make itself responsible for errors. On the continent of Europe the post-office pays damages if a registered letter is lost.

Finally, a world telegraph union has been discussed, and it would bring great advantage, as has the Universal Postal Union; but the chief obstacle in the way has been the private telegraphs of the United States. If we, in this country, buy the private lines and establish a public service, a world telegraph union will soon be formed, and that will be another one of those bonds which unite nations and make for international peace.

RICHARD T. ELY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR FUTURE NAVY.

BY S. B. LUCE, REAR-ADMIRAL, UNITED STATES NAVY.

In his "Essay on History," Lord Macaulay observes that "no past event has any intrinsic importance; the knowledge of it is valuable only as it leads us to form just calculations with respect to the future." Agreeably to that precept, a retrospective survey, so appropriate in this centennial year, will enable us to form just calculations as to what may be reasonably anticipated in respect to the development of our new navy. A necessary condition of the forecast is that no violent political eruptions or international complications shall disturb the course hitherto followed by legislation on naval affairs.

Before proceeding further let us inquire what constitutes a navy. A navy is, in one sense, a sea army. Or, to speak more correctly, its principal constituent, a fleet, is a sea army, to which all the other component parts are but subsidiary. The French habitually speak of *les armées de terre et de mer*. The analogy between a land army and a sea army is often so close that at some points it merges into identity; and in certain problems of war the two may be reasoned upon as identical. Thus the main body of the land army, composed of infantry, may be compared to a fleet of battle-ships. The infantry of the line acts in masses, and on the field of battle constitutes the principal fighting force. The same is true of a fleet. Well disciplined, a mass of infantry in column or in square is almost impenetrable. Witness the terrible, but fruitless, charges of the French cuirassiers on the solid masses of the English infantry at Waterloo. One of the great lessons of war is that cavalry charges, except against cavalry, are indecisive unless supported by infantry. Says Hamley in his "Operations of War": "All the formidable inroads of Napoleon's horsemen on the British line availed nothing for the want of in-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fantry support." The same principle, precisely, applies to the operations of the sea army. The inroads of cruisers, which are analogous to cavalry, will avail but little unless supported by battle-ships. This position is incontestable. Napoleon regarded the infantry as the *arm of battles* and the *sinews of the army*. Infantry, in short, is the first instrument of victory. It finds a powerful support, however, in the cavalry and the artillery.

These tenets are admitted by all military writers, and are universally accepted. Let it now be asked how an army could be organized *without* infantry of the line. The soldier would probably answer that the question is an absurd one and unworthy of a serious reply. And yet that is just what we are trying to do with our sea army—otherwise known as the navy of the United States. That is to say, we are pretending to build up a navy without the constituents of a line of battle. We are building cruisers of various sizes, which correspond to the cavalry and light artillery of the land army; and we have monitors for coast and harbor defence, which supplement our fortifications; but we have no battle-ships to correspond to the infantry of the line, which constitutes the main strength of the line of battle.

James, one of the best historians of the English navy, remarks that the strength of a navy is *the line of battle*, rather than its detached or frigate force. "The latter may cruise about," he says, "and interrupt trade, or levy contributions on some comparatively insignificant colonial territory; but it is the former that arrays itself before formidable batteries and strikes dread into the heart of the parent state." Vice-Admiral Penhoat, a distinguished officer of the French navy, and an author of note, reaches the same conclusion. "The most powerful agent that can be employed for the defence of the coast," he observes, "is the fleet of line-of-battle ships. That is *the* active force of all others that is capable of defending any point on the coast that may be threatened by an enemy." After discussing the necessary qualifications of a battle-ship, he says:

"It will be seen, from what has preceded, that the fleet of the line is the foundation of a navy; and that no operations at sea of importance, such as bombardments, the transportation of troops, etc., etc., can be undertaken with security, unless the enemy's fleet of the line has first been rendered powerless."

"It is the line of battle, then, which should take precedence in its development over those accessory forces which, when joined to it, constitute together a navy. The secondary forces—the cruisers, transports, armored coast-guards, etc., etc.—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should, each according to its importance, have a certain relative proportion to the whole ; but they *should not impede the development of the principal power.*"

The policy thus clearly lined out has been advocated by the executive and combated by the legislative branch of the United States Government since the beginning of our existence as a nation, and up to a comparatively recent period ; and describes accurately the course followed in England, where everything relating to the navy is done seriously and with a definite purpose. Chief-Engineer J. W. King, United States Navy, in his admirable report on "European Ships of War," under the head of "The British Navy," writes:

"It is to the production of the most powerful sea-going fighting ships that the resources of the navy are first directed: ships sufficiently armed to resist the projectiles of any ordinary kind; sufficiently armed to silence forts, or to meet the enemy under any conditions proffered; sufficiently fast to choose the time and place to fight; and sufficiently buoyant to carry coal and stores into any ocean."

This statement finds emphatic confirmation in the recent Admiralty programme announced by Lord George Hamilton, the First Lord of the Admiralty. In brief, that programme calls for the building, between April, 1889, and April, 1894, of seventy vessels of war, ten of which are to be battle-ships, and sixty, cruisers of different types. The report says :

"A battle-ship, when completed, is not entirely efficient unless she has certain small vessels attached to her as scouts ; and we consider that, out of the seventy vessels, twenty are the *satellites* of the battle-ships. The remaining cruisers will be effective whether used in squadrons or individually. . . . Later on, when an increase is made to our battle-ships, each battle-ship will be accompanied by two smaller vessels ; and thus there will be no drain upon our force of independent cruisers."

The strength of the British line is to be brought up, in the near future, to something over one hundred battle-ships, with cruisers, great and small, in proportion.

Let us now suppose the battle-ship to be subtracted from the floating force of Great Britain. How long could she hold Gibraltar and Malta, control the Suez Canal, and maintain her Indian Empire by the eastern route ? How long could she hold the line from London to Halifax, Esquimault, and India by the western ? How long could she prevent Germany from establishing a military port on the Scheldt ? How long could she hold the great strategic points at Jamaica, Barbadoes, and St. Lucie, which dominate the West Indies, the Spanish Main, and the Isthmian Canal, which will eventually open to her a short cut to the Pacific ? Without bat-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tle-ships the whole British Empire would crumble to pieces, "and, like the baseless fabric of a vision, . . . leave not a rack behind."

In the absence of anything and everything that might resemble a naval policy, we have reversed the usual order of naval development. The battle-ship being the very foundation of a navy, and the United States having no battle-ship, it is plain that in a military sense—the only sense in which a navy can be discussed—she has no navy. Not only that, but she has no foundation whereon to build one. She has the necessaries only—the *satellites*, the cruisers, and the coast-guard ships. The great central body about which the satellites revolve—the solid masses of the line, which give the cruisers moral and material support—are altogether wanting. In military parlance, we have a a few light infantry (cruisers) for scouts ; and cavalry (cruisers) for reconnoitring ; but, in case of repulse, there is no main body of the line to fall back upon. One of the functions of light infantry is to protect the flanks of the army. Our cruisers are to protect the flanks of—what ? Nothing ! There is no main body, no line of battle, no battle-ship, no navy—nothing, in short, but accessories.

Let us test the truth of this. International complications arise of such a character that the government finds it necessary to send a number of our best ships to a distant point, Samoa for example. On reaching the place designated, the American admiral, in the "Baltimore," as flag-ship, and accompanied by the "Newark," "Philadelphia," and "San Francisco," all splendid 4,000-ton ships, of the most approved types, finds himself confronted by four battle-ships to dispute his way. The vital parts of the foreign ships and the crews are well protected by heavy masses of steel; while the sides of the "Baltimore" and her consorts, though of steel, are but little thicker than a single number of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, or, to be exact, five-eighths of an inch thick—sides of no greater powers of resistance than the frigate "Constitution," launched in 1797, possessed. Do the people of this country expect their admiral to risk a battle under such circumstances ? Hardly, for those ships were designed expressly *to run away from battle-ships*, as will presently be shown. That is the fundamental idea which is guiding the development of the new navy: to run away.

It may be observed here that the word *fleet* is sometimes used to express the entire floating force of the navy. This use of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

word is common both in England and in France. In a more limited and technical sense, a *fleet* is an assembly of twelve or more battle-ships. Used in this latter sense, Great Britain will soon be able to put afloat seven or eight fleets, each fleet filled up to its tactical complement of twelve battle-ships; each battle-ship accompanied by two satellites; with cruisers, torpedo depôt-ships, and hospital-ships; while cruisers, acting independently, will be left to protect her own commerce and annihilate that of an enemy. If the military necessities of England compel her to maintain, say, six fleets and their accessories, and the Great Powers of Europe keep afloat proportional numbers, is it not to the interest of the people of this country to have a floating force of something more than mere accessories? Is it not to the interest of our people to have a navy in reality, instead of the semblance of one? Is it not to our interest to have at least *one* fleet of twelve battle-ships? That is the question the Executive has been presenting to Congress for the past one hundred years.

With all her enormous iron ship-building facilities, England allows from three and a half to four years to build a battle-ship. In this country it would probably take a little longer. The keel of the "Chicago," which is not a battle-ship, was laid in 1883, and she is not yet ready for sea; and this at a time when the government is much pressed for ships. Should either of the battle-ships "Maine" or "Texas" ever be launched, her time on the stocks will probably cover a period of from seven to eight years. Making the most liberal allowance for increase of skilled labor in iron ship-building, it would be twenty years at least before the United States could get a fleet of battle-ships to sea,—and in these days wars are reckoned by months. If the American people contemplate building up a navy, it is not a day too soon to formulate some definite plan of development beyond mere accessories.

If there is any one fact made clear by the history of the past, it is the true function of our navy. The rôle of a navy is essentially *offensive*, as contrasted with sea-coast fortifications, which are *defensive*. This broad distinction must be borne in mind, if the persistent, but unavailing, efforts of our highest naval authorities, in time past, to organize a navy, are to be understood.

"The proper duty of our navy," it was declared long since, "is *not* coast or river defence; it has a more glorious sphere—that of the *offensive*. Confident that this is the true policy as regards the employment of the navy proper, we doubt not that it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

will, in the future, be acted on, as it has been in the past; and that the results, as regards both honor and advantage, will be expanded commensurately with its enlargement. . . . In order, however, that the navy may always assume and maintain that active and energetic deportment, in *offensive operations*, which is at the same time so consistent with its functions and so consonant with its spirit, we have shown that it must not be occupied with mere coast defences."

The great principles on which our entire system of sea-coast defence has been erected have been laid down with mature deliberation by our highest military and naval authorities. "The means of defence," say they, "for the seaboard of the United States, constituting a system, may be classed as follows: First, a navy; second, fortifications; third, interior communications by land and water; and fourth, a regular army and well-organized militia." * The term Navy is defined as "that portion only of our military marine which is capable of moving in safety upon the ocean, and transporting itself speedily to distant points." This can be done only by battle-ships equal, if not superior, in fighting power to the average battle-ship of a possible enemy. "Floating batteries, etc., etc.," were regarded as pertaining to land defences, and were deemed "powerful auxiliaries." "The *Navy*," it was said, "being the only species of *offensive force* compatible with our institutions, it will be prepared to act the great part which its early achievements have promised, and to which its high destiny will lead."

Benjamin Stoddert, our first Secretary of the Navy, thoroughly understood the office of a navy. In a communication to the House of Representatives under date of December 29, 1798, after advancing the most cogent reasons, he recommended the building of twelve battle-ships and as many frigates. "Had we possessed this force a few years ago," he adds, "we should not have lost, by depredations on our trade, four times the sum necessary to have created and maintained it during the whole time the war has existed in Europe." In a subsequent report, January 12, 1801, the Secretary enunciates a sound principle. He says, in effect: Let our enterprising privateersmen prey on the enemy's commerce. The government should "*attend principally to a provision for battle-ships and frigates.*" The two reports are note-

* It may not be out of place here to explain that in classing the navy, which is the arm of *offence*, among the elements of *defence*, the words are to be taken in their military sense. Thus we have many instances in history of "defensive-offensive' campaigns, where the defence takes the initiative. The true war of defence, military writers affirm, seeks every occasion to *meet* the enemy. The French defend themselves by attacking.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worthy as clearly indicating the true lines of naval development, by the building, first of all, of battle-ships, and showing that the preying upon an enemy's commerce was altogether secondary and not the first objective of a navy.

It cannot be said that Congress responded with alacrity to these earnest appeals. We were paying tribute at the time to the Barbary powers. French cruisers were depredating our commerce and English vessels of war were impressing seamen out of our merchant vessels; but the navy which could, and eventually did, put a stop to these indignities, found little favor with our national legislature. The Naval Committee, reporting to the House, December 17, 1811, said:

> "The important engine of national strength and national security, which is formed by a naval force, has hitherto, in the opinion of the committee, *been treated with a neglect highly impolitic*, or supported by a spirit so languid as, while it has preserved the existence of the establishment, has had the effect of loading it with the imputations of wasteful expense and comparative inefficiency."

We were on the verge of war with England when this "languid spirit" in regard to naval affairs prevailed in the House of Representatives. In 1799 Congress had authorized the building of six battle-ships; but, the amount appropriated being insufficient, no steps had been taken towards setting them up, beyond the purchase of some ship timber, so that a few frigates and sloops-of-war were all we had of a navy.

On the 19th of June, 1812, war was proclaimed against England. Elated by the success which attended our little navy in its first encounter with the English at sea, Congress, now that war was actually begun, authorized the President, "*as soon as the materials could be procured,*" to cause to be built, equipped, and employed four battle-ships and six frigates. "This was the first step," says Cooper, the historian of the navy, "that was ever actually put in execution towards establishing a marine that might prove of material moment in influencing the results of a war." But—and this is one of the impressive lessons of history—although hostilities lasted two and a half years, the first battle-ship to be launched, the "Independence," was too late to take part in the war. The successes attending the War of 1812, and the placing of the Navy Department upon a better footing, by giving the Secretary of the Navy a staff of experienced officers—the navy commissioners—to assist him in his duties, excited a passing interest in naval affairs. This was not a little

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enhanced by the brief war of 1815 with the Barbary powers. Under the impulse of this feeling, Congress authorized the augmentation of the navy to twelve battle-ships. Owing to the limited amount of the annual appropriations, and the small number of seamen allowed by law, but four ships were kept in active service. Three were during many years laid up "in ordinary," and five held in reserve on the stocks in such an advanced stage of completion that, on the first sign of approaching hostilities, they could have been launched and equipped for sea in a comparatively short space of time. Built of well-seasoned live-oak, they could almost be said to defy the ravages of time. They were broken up, or diverted to other purposes than originally intended, only when the type of battle-ship they represented had become obsolete. They were, with but two exceptions, the very best specimens of naval architecture of the period and distinctively American in weight of batteries, great strength, capacity, sea-going qualities—everything, in short, that constituted a high order of excellence in a battle-ship of their day.

A flag-ship, it may be remarked, is a fair exponent of the strength of a navy. In the noon-tide of our naval power, the flag (or broad pennant) of the commander-in-chief was flown by a battle-ship. To-day it is displayed either from a second-rate, that has already reached the limits of usefulness, or from a third-rate but little better off. These are soon to be replaced by a class of flag-ships whose character shall be portrayed later on.

In 1823 President Monroe announced the doctrine which has since taken his name. It embraced two interdependent parts—one political, one military. The former only is now remembered. The formal declaration that the American continents "are not to be considered as subject to colonization by any European power" carried with it an obligation to maintain the means by which that policy could be enforced. Hence the President's admirable letter of January 30, 1824, to the United States House of Representatives against an undue reduction of the navy. The message was accompanied by a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, in which the naval policy of the government was plainly stated.

"When the vessels now authorized by law to be built," he writes, "are completed, there will be twelve battle-ships. . . . The vessels having been built, we must train officers to command and manage them. . . . A great portion of the science of the naval commanders can be acquired only on the ocean and by years of labor and discipline."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Accompanying these letters was the draft of a bill for a naval peace establishment; but it found little favor in Congress, and nothing was done.

In 1836 we had reached the meridian of our naval power. On the 18th of February of that year the Senate passed a series of resolutions, one of which ran as follows :

> That the President be requested to cause the Senate to be informed of "the probable amount that would be necessary to place the naval defences of the United States upon the footing of strength and respectability which is due to the security and to the welfare of the Union."

The Executive replied that "the force to be prepared ready for use when circumstances may require it should consist of fifteen battle-ships, twenty-five frigates, twenty-five sloops-of-war, twenty-five steamers, and twenty-five small vessels, and that the frames, ordnance, etc., etc., should be prepared for ten battle-ships and ten frigates." It was proposed, further, that six battle-ships, eleven frigates, fifteen sloops-of-war, and a number of smaller vessels should be kept in active service during peace, "for the protection of our commercial interests, and *to prepare officers and others for the efficient management of the force proposed for a state of war.*" The year 1850 was fixed upon as the most remote period at which the proposed force ought to be ready. The board was of the opinion, however, that it might be prepared much sooner, "should Congress deem it advisable to make larger appropriations than those suggested." But Congress did not "deem it advisable"; indeed, did not deem it advisable to make any increase whatever. Six years after making their report, the able staff of the Secretary of the Navy—the navy commissioners—were legislated out of existence, and the year 1850 passed, and 1860 and 1870 and 1880, and now we find ourselves approaching the year 1890, and instead of a "gradual increase," there has been a gradual degeneration of the navy, and we have not to-day a single battle-ship to succeed those launched in 1818-20.

The decline of our naval power cannot be attributed to a radically defective form of naval administration alone, though that is responsible for much of the evil. There is another cause. According to natural laws, the military and mercantile marine of a state rise and fall together. The exception to this law is when a purely military policy compels the maintenance of a war marine; and we are not a people to exercise military previsions.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the early days of the world's history war-vessels were needed to keep down piracy and enable traders to pursue their way in peace. An extensive commerce begot distant colonies, and both required the constant protection of a war marine. Then a navy came to be an exponent of a nation's wealth and power. The commerce and navy of Tyre grew together, and together fell. Carthage in her days of prosperity monopolized the trade of the Mediterranean, and her navy for a time defied the whole power of Rome. During the middle ages, the Italian Republics, Venice and Genoa, had large interests in commerce and powerful navies. With the loss of the one the other passed away. Spain, Portugal, and Holland, each in its turn, went through the same experience. England presents the greatest example in history of enormous wealth acquired through foreign trade. Colonial possessions followed, and a navy which defies the united forces of any two maritime countries in the world was the natural result.

For a time the United States followed England in her extension of ocean commerce. The American flag became a familiar sight on every sea, and the tonnage engaged in our foreign trade ran up to be second only to that of England. But our foreign shipping had already begun to decline before the breaking-out of the rebellion in 1861. Our people were, and are, content to have their carrying trade borne in foreign bottoms, and to see what was once a source of national pride and strength and power, transferred to foreign flags to help make their countries rich and strong. Having sacrificed a large measure of our shipping interests, and with no outlying possessions to protect, what more natural than that there should be a decline of our naval power? Blind or indifferent to the military aspect of the question, the resultant of the several causes has forced the navy to abandon its principal and time-honored rôle as the offensive arm of the government, thrown it back upon the lines of defence, and gradually withdrawn it from the sea. The tendency of the entire navy now is to get on shore—and stay there.

The "new navy" took its rise in 1881. The very term is suggestive. It is peculiar to this country, and indicates our methods of procedure in all matters connected with naval affairs. In the maritime countries of Europe naval architecture kept pace with the changes that have been going on for years past in naval and military science. Marine architects and their artisans moved with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the times; and the naval officers and seamen had no difficulty in adapting themselves to the continuous, but gradual, changes. These changes were brought about by such slow degrees that there was no precise date to mark the decease of an obsolete type of ship and the birth of a new. It was not so in the United States. On the close of the War of the Rebellion we sat down to rest. What mattered it though we had given the "Monitor" to the nautical world, and a fresh impetus to marine architecture? We ourselves sat down to rest. The building of vessels of war, in which we had once led the navies of the old world, became to us a lost art! and a quarter of a century after the "Monitor" had effected a revolution in the art of naval warfare, we find ourselves compelled to go abroad for the models of our war-ships; meanwhile having our naval constructors educated in foreign schools of naval architecture. The building of the battle-ship "Texas" from English designs marks a distinct era in the history of the United States Navy.

For twenty years from the War of the Rebellion the Executive had been urging the augmentation of the navy with monotonous iteration; but the people, or their representatives in Congress assembled, would not have it. What wonder we should drop from the list of sea powers? The first Advisory Board was instructed to "recommend such vessels as Congress would be ikely to approve"—not what, in the judgment of the Executive, the country ought to have, but what it could get. This was the lesson of generations of experience in naval administration. The board reported, therefore, that, as the limit of money Congress would be willing to appropriate for the navy was, without doubt, a very restricted one, the construction of iron-clads (battle-ships) was not recommended, though "such vessels are absolutely needed for the defences of the country in time of war; and if Congress be willing——" But, as in 1836, Congress was *not* willing. Hence the plan for the new navy was not for a navy at all, but for a sort of *pis aller*.

The new steel cruiser upon which we pride ourselves—and justly so—is designed, as already stated, with a special view to run away from battle-ships. She must be able to escape from iron-clads, and outrun, so as to capture, merchantmen. "If slower than iron-clads, she could not keep the sea; and if slower than merchantmen she might as well remain in port." (Report of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Secretary of the Navy, December 1, 1888.) This is all very well, but fifty years ago we could have sent to sea a squadron of ten battle-ships that would have compared favorably with those of any nation on the globe, and to-day we have none.

It is true we have the keels of two battle-ships on the stocks, and they may be finished and even sent to sea before the types they represent become obsolete. Even that addition to the navy would avail but little unless they are the forerunners of others. In 1836 the official programme called for fifteen battle-ships. To-day we need twenty at least. When we shall have put one-half that number afloat we may begin to talk about "rehabilitating" our navy without provoking a smile of derision.

But the people, or their representatives in Congress, are not willing to rehabilitate in that sense. Hence the United States Navy of the future is to be made up of coast-defence vessels, which, according to our custom, will be laid up "in ordinary," and thin-sided steel cruisers for the high seas. Consequently the American flag is to be displayed upon the ocean only by vessels designed to prey upon private property, and this notwithstanding our own proposition to amend the rules of international law by exempting private property at sea from capture.

During the Franco-German war in 1871 it was the French battle-ship that dominated the North Sea. The preying upon the private property of the citizens of either belligerent played a wholly insignificant part in the war. And yet that part, insignificant as it is in a maritime war, is the principal objective of the United States Navy of the future. Thus do we virtually abdicate our position as a sea power.

Kinglake, in his "Invasion of the Crimea," draws, with pardonable pride, a fine picture of the moral effect of the presence of an English man-of-war. It was just before the battle of Alma, when, "as though in arrogant, yet quiet assertion of an ascendant beyond dispute, one solitary English ship, watching off the Sebastopol harbor, stood sentry over the enemy's fleet. Men had heard of the dominion of the seas; now they saw it." That "solitary ship" represented the vast, living power of a people ever ready to wield it.

A solitary American steel cruiser, with its delusive prefix of "protected," represents the latent possibilities of a great country placidly awaiting some national disaster to generate its mighty forces.

S. B. Luce.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE THRONE IN ENGLAND.

BY JUSTIN M'CARTHY, M. P.

"THE throne in danger!" used to be the alarm-cry of all the ancient Tories and other old fogies of a past generation in England. We never now hear a word about the throne being in danger. We have had during the last few years many measures passed into law which ought to have made the bones of the Eldons and Wetherells to turn in their graves. Of course, we have had plenty of talk about revolution and socialism and anarchy and so forth; but, oddly enough, we have heard nothing about the throne being in danger. Now, I have often noticed in political life, both at home and abroad, that the very time when society comfortably settles down to the conviction that some particular institution is certain to last forever is also the very time when prudent friends of the institution would do well to consider seriously whether its future is quite so well assured as society's opinion reports.

Is the throne of England in any immediate danger? it will naturally be asked. So far as I can see, it is in no immediate danger whatever. Nobody threatens it; no popular outcry is raised against it. Indeed, if one were to look only at the surfaces of things, he might be apt to believe that the throne is more firmly fixed in England now than it was some fifteen or sixteen years ago. Then there really did seem to be growing up in this country something like a republican party. Sir Charles Dilke first made himself prominent as one of the leaders, or, at least, one of the heralds, of a republican party. He went round some of the great cities and towns of the north of England and denounced the cost and the parsimony of royalty with much energy; and a series of little riotings was the consequence, which observers on the European continent in some instances mistook for the overture to a revolution. At the same period, and in a debate started by Sir Charles Dilke in the House of Commons, Mr. Auberon Herbert, brother of the Conservative Earl of Car-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

narvon, proclaimed himself a republican, and a wild scene of excitement followed, and a great many loyal members of the House seemed to have turned themselves for the moment into bellowing madmen. At that time, too, a little school of writers, some of them men of great capacity and distinction, used to proclaim themselves republicans and to publish articles commending the republican form of government. At great meetings of London workingmen republican principles were openly avowed, and were applauded to the echo that should applaud again. A very shrewd and self-possessed observer from within and not from without told me then that he fully expected to see within a short time an openly-republican party, small, indeed, but intellectual and influential, established in the House of Commons.

Time has gone by and there is no republican party established in the House of Commons; nor do members of that House now hear a single word said about a republic. I do not quite know what the present opinions of Mr. Auberon Herbert are on the subject; he seems lately to occupy himself with different topics altogether. I do not think it likely that the opinions of Sir Charles Dilke are changed; but he has not for ever so many years said a word in public on the subject. The fact is that the subject has dropped. As Mr. Bright said at the time, the republican question had not really come up in England. It was put forward prematurely and had to be immaturely dropped. We had ever so many pressing matters to occupy us in Parliament and public life generally, and it was found that the republican question had little more than an academic interest, which in politics means no interest at all.

Therefore we hear nothing in England just now of any danger to the throne as an institution. But does that mean that the throne is necessarily to be perpetual? Nothing of the kind—at least, it does not necessarily mean anything of the kind. It means that nobody thinks the throne an institution which requires to be at once reconsidered or remodelled or abolished. It is no pledge for the permanence of an institution in England that at some given time there is no talk about abolishing it. Take an illustration of this fact. Consider the case of the House of Lords. We hear very little now at public meetings about the reform or the abolition of the House of Lords. Does this mean that the public of England are growing better satisfied with the House of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lords? Not at all. It only means that the people of England have more pressing work on hand than the reconstruction of the second Parliamentary chamber. Their hands are full just now. Until the Irish question is settled, no other large scheme of reform has the slightest chance of being taken in hand. But everybody knows perfectly well that as soon as the country has time to turn its attention that way the second chamber will be reconstructed. Take, again, the case of the Established Church in England. We do not hear nearly so much said on this subject as we used to hear some years ago. But the churchman would be sanguine indeed who ventured therefore to believe that the church is a permanent institution. Now, I am not comparing the throne of England with the House of Lords or with the Established Church. As regards the House of Lords the comparison would be quite absurd; for no one can doubt that a large proportion of the English people are profoundly convinced of the superiority of the monarchical system and are deeply attached to the throne and the reigning family, while no reasonable being professes to believe that there is a word to be said in favor of the heriditary principle in law-making. The case of the Established Church is a better illustration. Most churchmen are deeply attached to the state church as an institution; many firmly believe that its disestablishment would do great harm to the interests of religion. But I should fancy that there are few really thoughtful and observant Englishmen belonging to the Church of England who do not see that the principle of a state church cannot for very long be maintained in England. But here comes the difference between the church and the throne. A large mass of the population have for years and years proclaimed themselves uncompromisingly hostile to the state-church principle; there is no such open and avowed hostility to the principle of a limited monarchy. My object in bringing forward these illustrations is merely to show that the absence of any organized opposition to an institution, or, indeed, of any unfriendly criticism with regard to it, does not, in English public affairs, furnish any conclusive evidence that the institution is destined to be perpetual.

Let us try to get at some idea of the feeling of various classes in these countries towards the throne. As regards the present sovereign, there can be no doubt that wherever she is known she

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is popular. I fully believe that she is, on the whole, the best queen that history has known. As a constitutional sovereign, her conduct has been without praise. In Scotland, where she is well known, she is much loved by the people. In Ireland, of course, she is practically forgotten. The vast mass of the people neither like nor dislike her; they know nothing about her; she never comes into their minds. It could not be otherwise; for, as far as Ireland is concerned, one must admit either that the sovereign has no personal duties toward that country or that the duties have not been discharged. From the royalist point of view this is deeply to be regretted; for the natural tendency of the Irish people is to be devotedly loyal: it must, indeed, have been a persistent neglect that could have so completely extinguished the feeling of loyalty in the Irish people. For myself I am not at all sorry for it. I do not admire that fervor of personal devotion to this, that, and the other sovereign. There seems to me to be something unmanly and unwholesome about it; I think my countrymen are much better without it. However, there is a plain fact to carry in our minds while we are considering this subject—the fact that the vast majority of the people in one of these islands do not feel the slightest interest in the maintenance of the monarchical principle in Great Britain. Of course, I do not venture to say whether this condition of feeling in Ireland might not be greatly changed, say, by the sight of a sovereign going over every year to open a national parliament in Dublin. I am only telling of what actually exists in Irish feeling and the reason for its existence.

How are things in England and in Scotland? Undoubtedly the wealthier classes almost everywhere in England and Scotland are in favor of the monarchical principle. They like royalty and all it surroundings—the effect it has on society, the distinctions it maintains and confers, the social honors which it offers as a prize to wealth. In London, and among the class of people who come up to London for the season, the throne is like the sun; their world would be dark without it. The prime beauty and glory of their lives would have gone out if had they not a Court to go to and to talk about. It is a great day in a girl's life when she gets presented at Court. The Prince and Princess of Wales are personally very popular—he with a very large circle; she with everybody. I never heard any one say a word of the Princess of Wales except in her praise. When I make a certain qualification with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

regard to the Prince, it is because there is a section of the older nobility who do not profess quite to admire the way in which the hospitalities of Marlborough House are conducted. They do not find the principle of selection very carefully applied there. They would not much like to be associated with the place and its various companionships. They would rather that the Queen herself were at the head of society in London again, controlling and directing it. All these, however, are, of course, thoroughly loyal to the monarchical principle and to the reigning house. It may, perhaps, be news to some Americans to be told that even still there are among the English nobility a small, a very small, number of men and women who do not go to Court because they cannot in their consciences admit that Victoria is the lawful Queen of England. They are still faithful to the Stuart tradition; although they have not the faintest dream or hope of a Stuart restoration, and are as little likely to trouble the reigning house as the Bench of Bishops are likely to do. But, as one of this small group—I do not know whether they can even be properly called a group—once said to me, "to admit the existence of a fact does not prevent your conscience from judging of it." So they obey their consciences and maintain that there is no real sovereign but a a Sovereign of Divine Right. These men and women do not count for anything in the question we are now considering. I only mention them because I think their position is worthy of notice and, in a certain sense, is highly interesting.

All "society," then, in England is monarchical and is attached to the reigning family. This is perfectly correct as a general statement and will not be seriously affected by the fact that among the aristocracy there is to be found here and there a theoretical republican. Society in England is monarchical; wealth also is monarchical. The London shopkeeper, of the West End at all events, is monarchical and loyal. He depends for much of his living and his success in life upon the Court and the classes who frequent it; and M. Josse was a jeweller, as we all know. Of course, the great land-owners are all monarchical,—and so are most of the new rich men. But the loyalty of the territorial magnate is a tradition, and that of the new rich man is a condition of respectability. In any time of great national convulsion, the territorial magnate and the new rich man would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not count for much. The working classes and the poor will always have to count for much. I do not want to exaggerate the evidences to be found in recent popular movements here of a growing tendency to socialism. But I think the man must be blind who does not see that there are such evidences. The reader will presently see their bearing on the subject of this article.

The main bulwarks of the throne in England are, or I should rather, perhaps, say were, three in number. First and most ancient was the sentiment of loyalty, more or less deeply tinctured with the principle of divine right. Then there came—a sentiment or a conviction of much later birth—the comfortable belief that monarchy was an institution necessary for the stability of a state. The errors and extravagances of the first French Revolution strengthened this idea very much in the minds of Englishmen in a past generation; the doings of the Commune had an effect of a somewhat similar nature at a time nearer to the present. The English *bourgeois* got it into his head that only a monarchy could keep a state stable and prosperous. The feeling of security was the second great sustainer of monarchy in England. The third—the one great sustaining power now—is the quiet love of Englishmen for old-established institutions and their strong dislike to any manner of sudden and violent change. Now, let us consider how these chief securities of the throne have been affected by modern conditions in England. I think it will hardly be disputed that the old-fashioned, chivalric, sentimental feeling of personal loyalty has little or no active existence among English populations just now. We do not profess any longer to worship and adore any royal personage. We do not believe that the king's face gives grace, as the old ballad puts it. We should as soon think of professing to believe in the healing charm of the royal touch for the king's evil. These beliefs and professions were the natural companions of the principle of divine right; and they faded with it. There is no place for them in the practical life of the modern world. An Englishman now feels the highest respect for the monarchy and for the royal family; but it is a respect which has nothing whatever of the romantic in it. Some Englishmen and many more English women adore the Court and the throne and the members of the royal family with the adoration of the snob for rank and the mean hope of the snob that he or she may be allowed to come within the light of their glory. But that feeling is not in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

least like the old-world sentiment of loyalty. The people who cherish this more modern principle of devotion are not people who would be of the slightest use to the throne if the throne were in any danger. The worth of the monarchy to them is the fact that it keeps a Court around it at which it is believed to be a social distinction to be presented; and that it gives opportunity for a Marlborough House, where one may be invited occasionally to a dinner party or a ball; and that there are princes and princesses who may be prevailed upon to honor with their presence one's own dinner party or one's own ball. I leave it to my readers to judge for themselves how far this sort of loyalty could be reckoned on as the cheap defence of an endangered throne.

The second great safeguard of the monarchical system in England has been losing much of its strength. Even the British Philistine now does not believe that a republic means anarchy and confusion, battle, murder, and sudden death. The wild students in Henri Murger's "Bohemia" found that the pavement of a republic wears out one's boots as well as the pavement of a monarchy. The British Philistine is finding out, for his part, that a man may have boots to wear under a republic as well as under a monarchy. He sees that people manage to get on pretty well in the United States and that there is no more fear of a revolution in Wall Street or on Broadway than there is in Threadneedle Street or Pall Mall. The example of the French Republic so far has been reassuring to the ordinary Englishman. He has been able to see that even a French Republic can have its fierce political struggles and partisan rivalries and can get through them without recourse to the bayonets or the barricades. If the French Republic only continues firm and orderly for a few years more, the effect of that example will do a great deal—one can hardly say how much—towards familiarizing the mind of England with the idea that a Republic even in Europe may be just as stable, as orderly, and as strong as a monarchy. This would not precipitate a change of constitutional system here; but it would do much towards preparing the way for it. The English people would begin to ask themselves why they should not work a system which other people can work so well. The monarchical system stripped of the old romantic and poetic associations, and judged strictly with regard to its practical value and virtue, would not show well in comparison with a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

republic such as you have in the United States. The English people are, in my opinion, peculiarly well fitted to work a republic. They are, by nature and tendency, orderly and law-abiding. Then the very merits, public and private, of the present Sovereign have tended to make people used to a national life in which the monarch takes little or no part. Because the Queen is faithful to her constitutional duty it has become evident that the Ministry governs; that is, that a majority of the House of Commons governs; that is, that a majority of the people governs; and that the machinery would work on pretty much the same without a sovereign as with one. In a different way, the Queen's devotion to the memory of her lost husband, withdrawing her from society and public life for so many years, has left her little more than a mere name in the mind of the younger generation.

Some of the new conditions of things are tending, therefore, —I do not say to prepare the way for a republic, but to bring about a general willingness to entertain the idea of a republic in these islands. I do not want to go any farther than that; and I know quite well that a sudden failure of the French Republic would have a strong effect in the other direction.

I admit to the full the third great support of the monarchy—the traditional objection of the ordinary Englishman to sudden change of system. I very much doubt whether there are a hundred Englishmen to-day, even among professing republicans, or even among English republican artisans, who would put out a hand for the purpose of abolishing the monarchy merely because they would themselves be pleased if it were abolished. The existence of the monarchy does not occupy much of their thoughts. They look on the Queen as an excellent wife and mother—a character which the English working-man greatly respects; and they believe that the Prince of Wales is "a jolly good fellow." Therefore there is at present no feeling of direct and active hostility to the monarchical institution which could put it in the slightest danger. Therein I am ready to agree with the most devoted upholder of the system of monarchy. But the difference between us is that he is, doubtless, of opinion that this means perpetuity of tenure for the institution, and I am not. But I am quite willing to admit that the monarchy might possibly be allowed to go on forever in England if nothing else were to harm it more than the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mere spread of the belief that a republican system represents a better idea. We do not make revolutions in English constitutional life for ideas. That is not the Englishman's way. Perhaps it proves the superior brightness and activity of the minds of other peoples that they are ready to take no end of trouble to get their political systems into harmony with what they believe to be the best political theories. But so far as the Englishman is concerned, such peoples may "resolute till the cows come home"; they cannot "resolute" him into the Quixote of a political idea.

No one, I think, will complain that I have not taken full account of this great safeguard of the throne in England—the ordinary Englishman's dislike to change. Where, then, is any danger to the throne likely to come from? One very common danger to other thrones can hardly be feared for the throne of England. It is not in the least likely that there will be any difficulties about the succession. Whence is the danger to come? Well, suppose, for example, that we were to have at any time another George the Third—a conscientious, wrong-headed, obstinate man, who would insist on interfering in foreign politics; in overruling his ministers; in directing a foreign policy of his own. It is surely not impossible that such a monarch might come up again in England. Now, let us go on supposing a little more. Let us suppose that the policy of such a sovereign were to involve us in war—in a war which the people generally did not like. Let us suppose that a conscientious and popular minister resigned office rather than carry out the war policy, and knowing that he could not get the King to accept his ideas. Very well, some other minister is found; England goes into a struggle which her people do not like; and suppose that under some conditions of peculiar disadvantage her armies are defeated at first. Does any one believe that the throne would be able to withstand this shock? I certainly do not. The English people are wholly unused to defeat; I mean, of course, the defeat of one of their great armies in a great war. They could bear with patience a little reverse in South Africa, because all the world must know that it was but a mere accident, to be retrieved as soon as they could send out the men to do it. But a defeat of an English army at the hands of the Germans or the Russians—what a ferment of national passion would not that create in England! And if it were known that the policy of the Sovereign had made the war which had opened

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with such disaster, is it not quite on the cards that the crown might get knocked off in the convulsion ?

Of course, no such crisis could arise in the life of Queen Victoria. She has always been, as I have said, a thoroughly constitutional sovereign. Several times has there occurred in her reign a crisis where England seemed to be brought quite to the edge of a great war and where it was commonly understood that the sentiments of "the classes" went one way and the sentiments of "the masses" went the other. The Queen was supposed to have her inclinings, like other people; but if she had them then, unlike other people she kept them to herself, and they were not allowed to interfere for one instant with her duty as a constitutional sovereign. If she had been a woman of a different character, she might have found without much difficulty some statesman willing to persuade himself that her views were right and were his views also. The same that is said for the Queen may, I have no doubt, be said for the Prince of Wales. I do not suppose there would be the slightest likelihood of that genial and experienced man of the world attempting to be his own foreign minister, or, indeed, having any relish whatever for the work of such an office. Therefore I can say readily that I do not see any immediate chance of danger to the monarchy from undue and disastrous interference on the part of the sovereign. In any case, the danger would, according to my view of possibilities, be confined to the field of foreign policy. I can hardly imagine an English sovereign now setting himself against the wish of the great majority of the people on any question of domestic policy. Every one understands the domestic policy too well. The nation cannot be plunged blindfold into disastrous domestic legislation. But foreign policy is a totally different thing. The English people have often been led quite unconsciously up to the very verge of a foreign war, into which they never could have been plunged with their eyes open. Then at the moment of crisis it is so easy to get up a cry that the flag of England has been insulted and that the national honor requires to be vindicated. An interfering, headstrong sovereign and a pliant minister would have little trouble between them in so managing things as to make the people of England believe for the moment that the war, which was the fruit of the king's and the minister's own policy, was forced on them by the aggressive policy of a foreign state. Then suppose a late

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

awakening, disillusion, disappointment, defeat, disaster; and the war has still to be carried on; victory has to be struggled for at any risk, and struggled for unsuccessfully again and again,—and in the meantime what? Would the fall of the ministry, would even the impeachment of the ministry, satisfy the national idea? I, for one, do not think it would. Impeachment is obsolete in England. Popular revolution is never obsolete.

I do not attach much or, indeed, any importance to the fact that vast crowds of Londoners turn out to see any public performance in which any member of the royal family takes a part. The ordinary every-day life of the humble Londoner is so dull and barren that he is delighted at any opportunity of staring at anything. A company or two of infantry passing along Buckingham Palace Road will be followed for a mile by an excited crowd of gazers. The Lord Mayor's show on the ninth of November paralyzes all the traffic of that part of London through which it passes. The streets are literally blocked up by a crowd that stretches for miles; every window along the line of procession is alive with faces; extemporized rows of benches and seats are erected in the thoroughfares everywhere; the very roofs of the houses are covered with spectators. What does all this mean? Does it mean that the people of London are devoted to the Lord Mayor and are ready to lay down their lives in defence of the aldermen and the Common Council? Nothing of the kind. Outside certain official circles, nobody in London cares three straws for the Lord Mayor or would have the slightest objection to his institution being submerged in the new County Council for London, over which Lord Rosebery presides. To a vast population, not merely in England, but even in London itself, the sovereign is only as another Lord Mayor—a sight to be stared at on some rare occasion. The institution of royalty has no concern with their daily lives; it is not made by them or for them; it would not make the slightest difference to them if it were to be abolished to-morrow. They have no sentimental feeling of any kind about it. I do not believe that with the majority of such people there is any active feeling of dislike to it; I think there is no feeling either way. I am speaking now of what I may call the inert mass of the population.

But I am inclined to think that among the radical artisans in the great towns there is a good deal of dissatisfaction

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and discontent smouldering rather than burning. Such men grumble very much now and then at the cost of royalty; at the number of German princes and princesses quartered on the country; at the successive demands for marriage portions for this, that, and the other member of the royal family. There is much of the Socialist spirit spreading through the great towns, where the contrast between growing wealth on one side and growing poverty on the other is forced upon the attention of hard-working, ill-paid, ill-fed men and women. It is perfectly true that, if all the money voted annually to all the various members of the royal family were distributed among the poor of England, the national distress would not be sensibly alleviated. But hungry people do not argue in that way. They only see that enormous sums of money are yearly paid to a certain family, and they ask what that particular family is doing to earn the money. In London, at all events, the newspapers in by far the largest circulation among the poor are the radical Sunday papers, which are always attacking and denouncing the manner in which public money is lavished on the royal family. Take a very different sort of paper read by a very different class; I mean my friend Mr. Labouchère's *Truth*. *Truth* is high-priced; it lies on drawing-room tables and club tables; it is not read by the poor; it is a "society" paper altogether. Yet it is constantly showing up the cost of royalty, the sham offices created to gratify royalty's relatives and friends, the waste of public money on royalty's empty palaces and disused parks. Society, as I have said, is decidedly loyal; yet it reads and perhaps quietly chuckles over Mr. Labouchère's remarks, all the same.

The sum of all this as it shows itself to me may be put in a few lines. The glamour of the throne in England is gone. The dread of republican institutions is gone also. The vast majority of the population care nothing about royalty. There is nothing to hold on to, if from any cause royalty were to make itself unpopular in England at the time of some great national crisis. It is, at least, not impossible that we may one day have a bad king in this country; and in that case it seems to me that a complete change of system would be a more natural and probable event than a mere change in the succession.

JUSTIN MCCARTHY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR IGNORANCE OF ALASKA.

BY KATE FIELD.

AMERICAN citizens, living comfortably on the Atlantic seaboard, knowing their own wants and dictating terms to their submissive representatives, take little heed of those new additions to the United States which are destined to be the crowning glory of the Republic. When a nation is so big as to render portions of it a *terra incognita* to those who make the laws, there's something rotten this side of Denmark!

Congressional ignorance of the Pacific Slope, alas! is no new story. Why should pigmies realize what giants failed to know? When Daniel Webster towered in the Senate, he crushed under foot a proposition to establish a mail route between Independence, Missouri, and the mouth of the Columbia River, some 3,000 miles across plains and mountains. After generally denouncing the measure, Webster exclaimed:

"What do we want with this vast, worthless area? this region of savages and wild beasts, of deserts of shifting sands and whirlwinds of dust, of cactus and prairie dogs? To what use could we ever hope to put these great deserts or those endless mountain ranges, impenetrable, and covered to their very base with eternal snow? What can we ever hope to do with the western coast, a coast of 3,000 miles, rock-bound, cheerless, uninviting, and not a harbor on it? What use have we for this country?"

What use, indeed, have we for Kansas and Colorado and Montana and Oregon and Washington Territory and California, and that wonderful rock-bound coast "with not a harbor on it"? Shade of Massachusetts' great Senator, look down upon San Diego and the Golden Gate, gaze upon land-locked Puget Sound with its thousand miles of harbor, and blush—if shades can blush—at your old mortal blindness!

The march of Empire goes on in spite of human fallibility, and now the land of the midnight sun knocks at the door of Congress. She is twenty-three years old and asks to be treated as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

though she were of age. The big-wigs at Washington rub their eyes, put on their spectacles, and wonder what this Hyperborean hubbub means? What does "an Indian country"—as Attorney-General Williams called it—want?

Said a citizen of Alaska to Miss Scidmore not long ago: "If those Senators and Congressmen don't know any more about the tariff and the other things they help to discuss than they do about Alaska, the Lord help the rest of the United States! Their ignorance of the commonest facts of geography would disgrace any little Siwash at Fort Wrangel school. What have they paid for all these special government reports for, if they don't ever read them when they get ready to speak on a foreign subject, to say nothing of what can be found in the encyclopædias and geographies?"

"Alaska is good for everything," exclaimed Seward twenty years ago. "Alaska is good for nothing," retorted General Thomas. A Congressional committee, on reporting the bill for its purchase, sneeringly referred to "that latest and most questionable of National real-estate speculations," while the Press pointed with derision to that "tag-end of creation," "our new possession of Walrussia"!

General McDowell, never visiting Alaska and therefore unbiassed by personal knowledge, declared that, if no purchaser could be found, our government would be wise to give away "Walrussia" "to some country that would fulfill the Russian treaty obligations." General McDowell evidently sympathized with a relative of Lord Aberdeen who, coming from England, years ago, to inspect the Pacific coast, became greatly enraged because salmon would not rise to a fly, and reported that "the whole country was not worth a damn!" This intelligent envoy, as well as General McDowell, might have listened with amazement had they been present in the Dominion Parliament when, in 1878, the Honorable Mr. Bunster, with more foresight than our own countrymen, told a different tale.

"Honorable gentlemen might laugh, but looking at the matter from a national point of view, he fully meant what he said from his knowledge of the country, that the territory of Alaska possessed a more genial climate than Ottawa, notwithstanding its latitude, while its natural resources and capabilities were more valuable than people had any idea of. When honorable members of this house sneered at Alaska, he had a right to speak from his own personal knowledge, and tell them that they were mistaken; and the day was not far distant when, from the geographical position of this country, they would see the force of his remarks on this subject. The

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lease of Alaska was more than enough to pay one million dollars annually. It was the best investment the United States had ever made."

A cent an acre ought to be a good investment. What other portion of the United States has cost as little?

General McDowell's advice was not taken. Fortunately, Alaska was not given away. It has only been thrown away—so far as development is concerned. First came a military occupation, a few troops being sent to Sitka, the capital, on Baranof Island; to Wrangel, Tongas, and St. Paul. With the purchase of Alaska, Sitka became transformed. The town that once held a thousand Russians, a governor and his staff, a bishop with his train of priests, was deserted save by Indians and a few hundred Creoles and half-breeds, who from that day to this have remained in complete ignorance of the government to which they owe allegiance. San Francisco is the only town in the United States of which the majority ever heard.

In 1869 the Aleuts sent the following petition to Washington:

"We beg respectfully of the United States Government, and of our fellow-citizens all over the Republic, to regard us not as Indians,—we are not such,—but as fellow-citizens, struggling to advance in civilization, and to become worthy to be esteemed as fellow-citizens of the Republic."

The simple people of the Aleutian Islands appealed in vain.

Not very long after (August 20, 1870) General Jeff. C. Davis, commanding the Department of Alaska, reported to the Secretary of War that

"the natives of Alaska are peaceful, honest, and capable of transacting ordinary business quite well, and would doubtless improve themselves if they had a fair chance, but their present complete enslavement and robbery by an unscrupulous ring of speculators will ever prevent such progress."

Ten years of no government and military occupation brought to Sitka and the Alexander Archipelago rum and ruin—nothing more.

The year 1794 saw the first vessel built and launched in Alaskan waters. It left the primitive stocks inspired by Governor Baranof, and was christened "The Phœnix." In 1878 Sitka could no more have built a ship than it could have built the Pyramids. Everything had gone to decay. Both mind and matter were mildewed, and Sitka's only wharf was so out of repair, owing to being eaten by that mischievous marine, the *teredo navalis*, that it would have tumbled into the water had not $39.40, collected by the army as a wharf fund, been expended in repairs. To-day that same wharf is so dilapidated as to be almost use-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less. Passengers from the steamers are generally landed from a tug. The primitive plough-shares formerly sold to the indolent rancheros of California and Mexico were manufactured at Sitka's shipyard, as were axes, spades, hatchets, and hoes. The bells of the Pacific coast missions, many still in existence, were cast at the Sitka foundry. The knell of that Russian foundry was tolled long ago.

After the withdrawal of the military, Alaska was left without any government whatever, save the occasional presence of a revenue cutter, whereupon Gouverneur Morris, special agent, made such representations as should have received attention but did not.

"The policy of the government towards Alaska," wrote Mr. Morris, "has been a disgrace. Instead of encouraging emigration and a development of the resources of the country, enterprise has been discouraged." "There is no law," he continued, "for the recordation of conveyances. A man cannot sell a piece of property and give a deed for it which will be legal notice to third parties."

Under such conditions, of course, no land could be mortgaged.

"A man may be murdered in Alaska, his will forged, and his estate scattered to the four corners of the earth, and there is no power in a court of chancery to redress it."

Thoroughly desperate at the lack of government in the Territory, Deputy-Collector J. C. Dennis, stationed at Fort Wrangel, wrote June 15, 1878, to Collector Morris, asking to be relieved:

"I take this step on account of the manner in which the department is running this Territory."

"I have acted in the capacity of arbitrator, adjudicator, and peace-maker until forbearance has ceased to be a virtue. Within the past month one thousand complaints by Indians have been laid before me for settlement, and as I am neither Indian agent nor justice of the peace, I decline the honor of patching up Indian troubles for any time longer than can be obviated."

"Again, the prospect for Congress to extend law and order over this country looks gloomy, and in the absence of law at this port, no compensation that the government could offer me would be any inducement for me to act in the capacity of deputy collector another year."

The only recommendation the Secretary of the Treasury made to the Forty-fifth Congress in behalf of neglected Alaska was that the port of Sitka should be abolished! This document is well worth reading.

"Since the withdrawal of the troops from Alaska last Spring, the management of the Territory has practically devolved upon the Treasury Department. The only officers who could exercise any authority were the collector of customs at Sitka and his deputies stationed at other points within the Territory, the duties of the officers at the Seal Islands being confined exclusively to the protection of the seal interests. It was feared that the sudden withdrawal of the troops might result in a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

conflict between the whites and the Indians; but thus far little disturbance has occurred. The white population at Sitka is very limited, and the expense of maintaining customs officers there and at other points within the Territory has aggregated, within the past two years, $17,418.32, while the receipts from customs have, during the same period, been very much less. It is, therefore, recommended that the port of Sitka be abolished."

"Here's wisdom for you—chunks of it," as Jack Bunsby would remark. Gouverneur Morris truly rejoined that the Alaskan district was not one of revenue, but of protection. If trade had fallen off since the days of the tyrant Czar, whose fault was it? With such reasoning as the honorable Secretary's, would not many a postal route be abandoned? And the Secretary, after stating that the only officers in Alaska who could exercise authority were the collector of customs and his deputies, virtually recommended their dismissal!

Such was the criminal inaction of the Government which contented itself with drawing $317,000 annually from two small seal islands, leaving the rest of the country to fate. Nor were the people much enlightened by the literary pabulum prepared by experts.

"And so," wrote H. W. Elliott in 1877, "we took Alaska ten years ago, just as a big boy takes a strange toy, full of great satisfaction, and fired with the intense desire to investigate its inner workings, and, like the boy, we have made the examination, and we have laid the toy aside. How we pitied the ignorance of our Russian friends, who declared, in response to our call for information regarding its natural resources, that they had been so engrossed in the one idea of getting furs, that they really 'did not know of anything else'; and after ten seasons of careful inquiry we find, too, that we to-day don't know of anything else."

"However, though we have lost the wild apples of Sitka, and have failed to see the shimmer of golden fields of corn at Kodiak, yet we have much to please and far more to interest us in Alaska. It is a paradise for the naturalist, a happy hunting-ground for the ethnologist, a new and boundless field for the geologist, and the physical phenomena of its climate are something wonderful to contemplate. It is, and will be for years to come, a perfect treasure-trove for these gentlemen; but alas! it bids fair, from what we now know, never to be a treasure-trove for the miner or the agriculturist."

"Never" is so long a word as to make me wonder at its use by intelligence. That "never" employed by Mr. Elliott is certainly embarrassing when Juneau, a town of 1,000 inhabitants, is almost entirely populated by miners, and 150 miners are wintering (1887) in the valley of the Yukon, with the prospect of being joined in the spring by 500 more.

"If gold or silver is discovered in Alaska," predicts Mr. Elliott, "it must be of unusual richness or it will never support any considerable body of men up there, so far away from the sources of necessary supply. The reputed Alaska gold mines are not in Alaska at all, but on the Stikine River in British Columbia, being over 180 miles to the eastward of the boundary between the two districts; but as the Stikine River, to reach the Pacific with its rapid flood, has to pass through thirty miles of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Alaskan soil and rock, so the miners visit Alaska in this way only, as they go up and down the river from Cassiar to Victoria, the Sound, and California every spring."

Strange that Mr. Elliott should have so emphatically committed himself in 1877 when gold was discovered near Sitka in 1871 by a soldier named Doyle! It is unfortunate, too, for this gentleman that the most successful mine to-day in Alaska is "The Treadwell," the grade of which is exceedingly low, but which can be profitably worked on account of the facility in getting at it! What is true of "The Treadwell" will be more or less true of many other mines on Douglas Island, which is becoming an extended mining-camp. Nicholas Haley, of Sitka, was almost simultaneous with Doyle in finding gold, and he, as well as other Sitkans, expresses profound faith in the mineral richness of the neighboring islands.

Alaska is the land of topsy-turvy. Heretofore, placer mines have always been found in the beds of streams and in valleys. In Alaska they have been found on the top of a mountain one thousand feet high, as well as in the valley of the Yukon. Indians report gold in the mountain passes of the Chilkat River, while its color has been found near the mouth. The latest discovery of gold quartz is on the island of Unga.

The precious metals, however, are not Alaska's sole mining attractions. Coal and iron abound on the Chilkat River. In fact, there are evidences of coal on many parts of the coast, but only two mines are at present in operation, one being in the Arctic at Cape Lisburn. Years ago Professor Davidson, of the Coast Survey, discovered coal, which pervades an entire range of hills, the very dust of which adheres to the magnet. These hills extend thirty miles along the east bank of the Chilkat River. That there is copper in Alaska no observer can doubt. One hundred years ago Captain Dixon wrote of large circular wreaths of copper, both at Norfolk Sound (now Sitka) and Queen Charlotte's Islands, twisted into that shape by the natives themselves, who wore them as ornaments about their necks. Copper River is so called because of the metal found there that resembles the copper of Lake Superior. The Thlinkets possessed the art of forging this copper long before the advent of Europeans. Nor is lead an unknown quantity, while sulphur, galena, graphite, platina, marble, and cinnabar are known to exist. Petroleum has been discovered at Katenay on the main land opposite Kodiak Island.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In agriculture Alaska is not promising, but the country is by no means as impossible in this respect as it has been represented. "There is not an acre of grain in the whole territory," wrote Whymper. Because there was no grain grown it by no means follows that grain cannot be grown in certain localities. Hundreds of acres of land near Wrangel can be drained and cultivated. The Indians on the neighboring islands raise tons of potatoes and turnips for their own consumption. Butter made for me by the Scotch housekeeper of Wrangel mission was a sweet boon, and proved that cows were a success in that region, and that dairies were a mere question of time.

Let us return to Mr. Elliott's prophecies of ten years ago.

"Several 'patriots' living on Puget Sound and in Oregon have been urging some legislation by Congress which would result in creating a few offices up there, but they have met with deserved failure thus far. . . . Though we know now that Alaska will never be, in all human probability, the land for us, yet we have one great comfort in its contemplation, for we shall never be obliged to maintain costly mail routes or appoint the ubiquitous postmaster there. We shall never be asked by its people for a Territorial form of government with its attendant Federal expenses, and much as the coast looms up on the map, we shall never have to provide light-houses for its vacant harbors."

More "Nevers"! Five years after these predictions (1882) a few postal routes were established and "the ubiquitous postmaster" invaded Alaska. In 1883 Senator Harrison introduced a bill to provide a civil government for Alaska. Amended, it passed both houses and was signed by the President in May, 1884. Now the Territory has a governor, a district judge, a district attorney, a marshal, four deputy marshals, and four commissioners.

The bill of 1883 called for the enforcement of the laws of Oregon when applicable. As Oregon, however, is an inland State, and as Alaska, so far as settled, happens to be entirely seaboard, the laws do not properly apply. No land laws were passed, but it was conceded that Indians or other persons should not be disturbed in the possession of any lands actually in their use or occupation or then claimed by them. The mining laws of the United States were adopted. Here at least was a gain. Criminals, too, were no longer taken to Oregon for trial, at great waste of time, money, and patience. Verily, we are a most economical nation! We begrudge the establishment of a collector of customs at Sitka on account of a deficit in the revenue, and send criminals fifteen hundred miles in search of justice!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Governor is instructed to report upon the entire territory to the Interior Department, but as there is no steamer at his command, how can the Governor who is stationed at Sitka know of what is beyond the route of ordinary travel? The distance between Sitka and Unalaska, the seat of a colony and the home of a commissioner, is 1,200 miles. There is no steam communication with this continent save by the occasional vessels of the Alaska Fur Company. Those who need to avail themselves of the district court at Sitka must go first to San Francisco, and return by the same circuitous route, journeying nearly 8,000 miles instead of 2,400!

Any one wishing to visit the Kodiak district or the Aleutian Islands must hire or buy a vessel for the purpose. There is a mail service from San Francisco to Tahiti, another to the Fiji Islands, and one is proposed to the Samoan Islands; yet the Alaska districts, which may easily be made ten-fold more valuable than all the islands of the South Pacific, are outlawed. The Aleutian Islands have no mail service whatever, and the Sitkan Archipelago is only allowed a semi-monthly mail. The United States Treasury, overflowing with gold and silver, cannot afford to be even decently just to pioneers whose long night of six months needs to be cheered by news from their old homes.

"Much as the coast looms up on the map,"—and it looms to the extent of 25,000 miles,—Mr. Elliott can still triumphantly maintain that there is not a single light-house in the whole district. The Russians had a light in the castle at Sitka that was seen ten miles at sea.

No survey was made up to June 30, 1878, and now but one Government vessel is employed in this important work, the appropriation by Congress for the entire coast survey being so small as to leave but $5,000 for Alaskan waters. At present speed, it will require two more years to complete the survey of the course taken by pleasure-steamers. The next generation may record the completion of Alaska's entire coast survey. This is a fact, though, twenty years ago, almost the last words of Charles Sumner's address on Alaska pleaded for an immediate survey of its indented coast, to bring it all within the domain of science and assure to navigation much-needed assistance!

"We have learned enough of the country and climate by this time," continues Mr. Elliott," to know that the lands and fishing waters now occupied by the natives of Alaska will never be objects for the cupidity of our people."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Once more "never!" and already land occupied by natives is appropriated by the invading Caucasian, while the fishing waters, leaving out the burning question of the fur-seal monopoly, are attracting the attention of Atlantic fishermen with a view to colonizing. Why not, when the North Pacific teems with life? Why not, when in Alaskan waters are found seventy-five species of food fish, sixty of which can be put upon civilized breakfast- and dinner-tables? Why not, when the whale, sea-otter, fur-seal, hair-seal, walrus, salmon, cod, halibut, herring make Alaska one of the richest fisheries in the world?

"Indeed, what I have seen," said W. H. Seward at Sitka in 1869, "has almost made me a convert to the theory of some naturalists, that the waters of the globe are filled with stores for the sustenance of animal life surpassing the available productions of the land."

Salmon canneries already exist, and yearly become more numerous. At Killisnoo, five hundred barrels of herring are sometimes caught in a single haul of the seine, each barrel yielding about three gallons of oil. Three hundred thousand gallons of this oil are shipped yearly from this small port.

Then we hear, first, that there are no forests worthy of the name in Alaska; secondly, that though trees grow on the south-eastern coast and also border the rivers, their timber is worthless.

"If ever we utilize the spruce and fir timber on the Sitka Coast," argues Mr. Elliott, "we must encourage and foster the effort in the line of ship-building, for this timber is too gummy and resinous for the ordinary use of house-building and furniture-making."

Having once been an Alaskan industry, ship-building can be so again, for coal, iron, and lumber are next-door neighbors; meanwhile saw-mills multiply, and I have seen very big trees turned into material for house-building. Certainly red and yellow cedar, hemlock, white spruce, alder, and balsam-fir abound in the Sitkan Archipelago. La Perouse refers to "those superb pines fit for the masts of our largest vessels," and Belcher describes "a very fine-grained, bright yellow cypress, . . . which, besides being used in boats, was exported to the Sandwich Islands in return especially for Chinese goods." The most valuable timber is this yellow cedar, which often attains a height of one hundred feet. Professor Davidson says that trees have been found near Sitka one hundred and seventy-five feet high. Of the quality of the wood there are two opinions. Some wise men say it is too

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wet for enduring use, while others enthusiastically proclaim our Arctic province to be the great reserve lumber region of the world. At the lowest estimate, the supply of timber is reckoned at 57,000,000 feet, covering 300,000,000 acres. William H. Seward committed himself unreservedly on this point.

"I venture to predict that the North Pacific coast will become a common shipyard for the American continent, and speedily for the whole world. Europe, Asia, Africa, and even the Atlantic American States have either exhausted or are exhausting their native supplies of timber and lumber. Their last and only resort must be to the North Pacific."

We need not, however, look for a realization of this prophecy until the axe is no longer heard on Puget Sound.

That incorruptible patriot, Charles Sumner, builded even better than he knew when, in 1867, he aided the Secretary of State by delivering an exhaustive speech, which undoubtedly converted Congress to the wisdom of purchasing Alaska. Yet Mr. Elliott, strangely enough, does not hesitate to denounce that admirable *résumé* of facts and possibilities—as valuable to-day as it was twenty years ago. Says Mr. Elliott:

"The great speech of Sumner in favor of the treaty, and which, in the universal ignorance of the subject prevailing in the American mind at the time it was delivered, was hailed as a masterly and truthful presentation of the case, is, in fact, as rich a burlesque upon the country as was Proctor Knott's 'Duluth.' Sumner, however, meant well, but he was easily deceived by the cunning advocates of the purchase. No; no mention was made of these islands [Pribylov] and their fur-seal millions, but infinite stress was laid upon the commerce which would spring up," etc.

To label this exhaustive speech "a burlesque" is the worst possible criticism on the critic's own intelligence. To assert that no mention is made of the Pribylov Islands and "their fur-seal millions" is mere quibbling. Sumner does not actually name the islands, but, as he discusses "furs" at length, states that "the seal has always supplied the largest multitude of furs to the Russian Company," and gives the number of skins in detail that have been sold from time to time by this company, referring on one occasion to "an inexplicable absence of seal skins," Mr. Elliott is certainly indebted to his spleen for his "burlesque." "Amid all the concealment or obscurity which prevails with regard to the revenues of the company," adds Sumner, "it is easy to see that for some time there must be a large amount of valuable furs on this coast." Then he advocates preserving the seals by killing only a specified number yearly, under which economy the supply will vastly increase, as has been the case.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If Sumner, who "meant well," *was* "easily deceived by the cunning advocates of the purchase," on whom falls this accusation of deception? On the citizens of the Pacific coast.

"They were the first to ask for this enlargement of boundary, and will be the first to profit by it," says Sumner. "While others knew the Russian possessions only on the map, they knew them practically in their resources. While others were still indifferent, they were planning how to appropriate Russian peltries and fisheries. This is attested by the resolutions of the Legislature of Washington Territory; also by the exertions at different times of two Senators from California, who, differing in political sentiments and in party relations, *took the initial steps which ended in this treaty.*"

It is barely possible that one, if not both, of these Senators took no pains to enlighten Charles Sumner on the special value of the islands of St. Paul and St. George as seal-rookeries. There may have been method in their silence. Perhaps it was to the interest of certain individuals anxious to obtain a monopoly of the seal-trade, to keep it as much as possible in the background. Perhaps, too, it was merely a coincidence that one of these Senators, John F. Miller, became a member of the Alaska Commercial Company soon after Russian America was transferred to the United States. That Sumner, at the time of his speech, had no idea of the formation of this company is shown by his comments. "It remains to be seen," he says, "into whose hands the commerce [meaning furs] on the Pacific side will fall, now that the whole region will be open to the unchecked enterprise of our citizens."

Sufficient proof has been given, I think, that Sumner more than mentions those wonderful seals which to-day form a most interesting, as well as the largest, part of Alaska's population. That he lays "infinite stress upon the commerce that would spring up" is not true, if by "commerce" is meant trading outside of peltries, fisheries, mines, and lumber. Sumner pictures Alaska's resources as known in 1867, and but lightly dwells on the mines, which are a recent development. But when Sumner refers to the fisheries as "the most important of all" Alaskan products, is he not more of a prophet than his critics?

"What even are sea-otter skins," he asks, "by the side of that product of the sea, incalculable in amount, which contributes to the sustenance of the human family?" The sea-otter has almost disappeared; the seal will be exterminated if promiscuously slaughtered, as is probable when the present or a similar monopoly of the Pribylov Islands ceases; but on forever go the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

salmon and cod and halibut and herring, this last "one of those natural products whose use has decided the destiny of nations." Sumner sees Alaska supplying not only the Pacific States and Central and South America with fish, but also China and Japan. "It does not seem impossible for an energetic and commercial people to find a market here of inconceivable magnitude which will dwarf the original fur-trade with China, that was once so tempting." Possible? It is more than probable. Already there is a vision of Sumner's prediction, when "the beautiful bidarka will give way to the fishing-smack, the clipper, and the steamer. All things will be changed in form and proportion, but the original aptitude for the sea will remain; a practical race of intrepid navigators will swarm the coast, ready for any enterprise of business or patriotism. Commerce will find new arms; the country new defenders; the National flag new hands to bear it aloft." The statesman who advocated the purchase of Russian America, who named this "great land" Alaska, who so clearly foretold its history, can sleep peacefully while narrow souls attack his memory.

The "government" of Alaska, though better than ever before, is ridiculous, anomalous, unjust, and fraudulent. The territory has been acquired under false pretences, as can be shown by the third article of the treaty with Russia.

"The inhabitants of the ceded territory, according to their choice, reserving their natural allegiance, may return to Russia within three years; but if they should prefer to remain in the ceded territory, they, with the exception of uncivilized native tribes, shall be admitted to the enjoyment of all the rights, advantages, and immunities of citizens of the United States, and shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty, property, and religion."

What are the "rights, advantages, and immunities" of American citizens? This question is best answered by quoting Sumner for the last time. Addressing Congress, he says:

"Your best work and most important endowment will be the republican government which, looking to a long future, you will organize with schools free to all, and with equal laws, before which every citizen will stand erect in the consciousness of manhood. Here will be a motive power without which coal itself will be insufficient. Here will be a source of wealth more inexhaustible than any fisheries. Bestow such a government, and you will bestow what is better than all you can receive, whether quintals of fish, sands of gold, choicest fur, or most beautiful ivory."

Congress has bestowed nothing of this sort. Two generations have grown up in crass ignorance. Schools have been conspicuous by their absence, and no man can stand erect upon the bit of land that should be his, because there are no land-laws.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Indignantly protesting, the Hon. J. G. Swan, of Port Townsend, Washington Territory, exclaims:

"The country is not Indian country. It is ours by right of purchase from Russia. We obtained the fee-simple to the whole of Alaska by that purchase, and there is not one word in the whole of that treaty which reserved any right of joint ownership to either Indians or any other people. If the Government desires to open up Alaska to settlement, the same inducements should be offered as were held out in early days to settlers in Oregon and Washington Territory."

Like the dog in the manger, Congress will do nothing for Alaska, nor will it permit Alaska to do anything for herself locally, or at Washington through a delegate. Yet, in 1890, two islands of this despised and neglected province will have paid into the United States Treasury $6,340,000—within one million of Alaska's entire purchase!

It is estimated, on good authority, that Alaska now sends out yearly double the wealth brought in, her industries for 1887 being valued as follows:

Fur trade	$2,500,000
Gold (entire product)	1,350,000
Fisheries	3,000,000
Lumber and walrus ivory	100,000
Total	$6,950,000

Ivan Petrov, special government agent, states that Alaska,

" with its savage population of over 30,000, represents a larger volume of trade than any other portion of the United States inhabited by uncivilized tribes, even without reference to such mineral wealth as has been or may be developed within its limits, or to the net revenue derived by the Government above all its expenditure for Alaska from the lease of the fur-seal reservation."

This is the country that General McDowell would have given away; that Congress can barely discover on the map!

"What, Mr. Seward, do you consider the most important measure of your political career?" asked a friend.

"The purchase of Alaska; but it will take the people a generation to find it out."

The people have not yet found it out. Patience, long-suffering Alaska!

KATE FIELD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE NEGRO INTELLECT.

BY WILLIAM MATHEWS, LL.D.

AMONG the modes of solving the Southern problem, one in which many persons at the North have put faith has been a hoped-for division of the white vote at the South. It has been thought that if the Southern people could be ranged in opposing political parties, according to their varying views of political, economic, or moral questions, the political rights of the freedmen, which are now practically abridged, might be exercised in full. To this solution of the problem several leading men of the South have announced themselves as invincibly opposed. In a speech made on October 27, 1888, in Dallas, Texas, Mr. Henry W. Grady, editor of the Atlanta (Ga.) *Constitution*, declared that such a division of the white voters would be the worst thing that, in his opinion, could happen.

"The clear and unmistakable domination of the white race—dominating not through purchased alliance, but through the integrity of its own vote—that is the hope and assurance of the South. . . . Ignorance may struggle to enlightenment; out of corruption may come the incorruptible; but the supremacy of the white race of the South must be maintained *forever*. . . . *Let no man tinker with the work of the Almighty*. . . . No race has risen, or will rise, above its ordained place. Here is the pivotal fact of this great matter: two races are made equal in law, and in political rights, *between whom the caste of race has set an impassable gulf*."

This sentiment the *Constitution* calls, with exquisite but unconscious irony, "the spirit of democracy, pure and simple, in this region." Like views are expressed in a letter to *Harper's Weekly* by Mr. A. B. Williams, editor of a Democratic paper in Greenville, South Carolina, and by Mr. C. J. C. Puckette, a Texas politician.

The pith of their opinions is that ours is "a white man's government," and that the colored race, in spite of the rights guaranteed to them by the Constitution, have no place at the South except that which was the doom of the Gibeonites of old—of being "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for their late

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

masters. Note that it is not urged that the white race should rule so long as it is greatly superior in intelligence, character, and property, but that, as Mr. Grady says in another part of his speech, it "must dominate *forever*." No hint or hope is expressed of a possible distant time when, by education and training, the negro may become qualified to share in the work and responsibility of business, professional, and political life; but he must be robbed by perpetual white domination of all motives for self-improvement, till he shall have become so cowed, abject, and spiritless that he will cease to aspire to a higher condition or to dream of rising to influence through a capacity for performing the higher work of society. By the holders of such views the necessary and permanent intellectual inferiority of the negro is assumed, not because he lacks opportunities of self-improvement, but because, as they doubtless believe, he is naturally and hopelessly incapable of high culture. Of all the arguments used by the slave-holders and their apologists before the late war to justify the oppression of the blacks, and now used to excuse the perpetuating of white rule in another form, none has been urged more pertinaciously than this. Irrelevant as it is in either case, we purpose to show that it is baseless in fact. Granting the present inferiority of the negro, we affirm that it has never been proved; nor is there any good reason to suppose that he is doomed forever to maintain his present relative position, or that he is inferior to the white man in any other sense than as some white races are inferior to others.

On the threshold of all argumentation designed to show the negro's radical inferiority we used, in former days, to be pointed to his anatomical structure. Look, it was said, at his physical peculiarities, the shape of his skull, the projection of his jaws, his high cheek-bones, his broad flat foot with prehensile great toe and "lark heel," his short woolly hair and thick epidermis,—features which mostly indicate closer relationship to the chimpanzee than to the white man. But as it is admitted or implied in all the controversies concerning the negro to-day that he is a *man*, however low in the scale of humanity, we shall make no attempt to maintain the truth which Paul proclaimed on Mars Hill before the race-bigoted Athenians, that "God had made of *one blood* all nations of men to dwell upon the face of the earth." It is to the comparative mental weakness, to the asserted indo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lence and servility, the degradation and vices, of the negro, that we are pointed as reasons why he should be ruled by the white man. A thousand facts, however, show that the defects and faults of the negro belong to his *habits* rather than to his *nature;* are owing, not to his physical or mental constitution, but to the grievous hardships to which he has been exposed and the obstacles everywhere thrown in the way of his advancement.

Dr. David Livingstone, in speaking of "the status of the Africans among the nations of the earth," says: "We have seen nothing to justify the notion that they are of a different 'breed' or 'species' from the most civilized. The African is a man with every attribute of human kind." Foreign culture, which has penetrated in a moderate degree some regions of Africa, has been shut out from others by almost impenetrable barriers. Beyond these the aboriginal people remain secluded amid their mountains and forests in a state of instinctive existence—a state from which, as Prichard observes in his "Physical History of Mankind," human races "have hardly emerged, until moved by some impulse from without." Travellers who have visited the interior of Africa testify that in regions where the influence of the slave-trade has not been felt, in the fertile countries beyond the Sahara, the negroes' disposition is mild, gentle, and amiable; that, far from lacking ingenuity, they have adopted many of the arts of civilized peoples; that they have formed themselves into political societies; that their disposition to labor is as strong as that of white tribes similarly situated; that, in short, they manifest the same anxiety to improve their condition, the same desire to advance in knowledge and virtue, that distinguish the human species in all the rest of the globe. The negroes of this part of Africa dwell in towns of considerable extent, many of which are said to contain ten and even thirty thousand inhabitants,—a circumstance which implies a considerable advancement in industry and the resources of subsistence. The fact that in these regions the population once consisted of savages as wild and fierce as the natives farther south, shows that human society on that continent has not been everywhere stationary and unprogressive from age to age.

"The first impulse to civilization," says Prichard, "was late in reaching the interior of Africa, owing to local circumstances which are easily understood; but when it had once taken place, an improvement resulted which is, perhaps, proportional to the early progress of human culture in other more favored regions of the world."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But "no race has risen, or will rise," says Mr. Grady, "above its ordained place." Yes, but who shall say of any race, till it has had a fair trial, till it has had opportunities and incentives for self-improvement, what *is* its ordained place? What was the apparently "ordained place" of the Germans in the first centuries of the Christian era—the savages who, without cities, letters, arts, or money, consumed in sleeping, gluttony, debauchery, and gambling the days and nights that were not spent in fighting, often staking their personal liberty on their games of chance; whose drunken assemblies were often stained by the blood of friends and relatives; who adored the sun and moon, the fire and the earth, and propitiated their imaginary deities by the sacrifice of human victims? How much more hopeful than that of the Southern colored man to-day was the mental and moral condition of the Anglo-Saxon *villein* in the time of Henry II., when he was as absolutely dependent upon the will of the lord, and as incapable of holding any property, as the American negro before his emancipation? The lord claimed possession of the *villein* and of all that could belong to him, as he would have claimed possession of a horse or any other quadruped properly his own. Macaulay tells us that, when one of the ablest Normans attempted to win the hearts of his English subjects by espousing an English princess, his barons were shocked by the degradation. By many of them it was regarded as a marriage between a white planter and a quadroon would now be regarded in Virginia. Known in history by the honorable name of Beauclerc, he was called by his own countrymen by a Saxon nickname, in contemptuous allusion to his Saxon connection. The same historian tells us that in the time of Richard I. the ordinary imprecation of a Norman was, "May I be an Englishman!" His ordinary form of indignant denial was, "Do you take me for an Englishman?"

Again, we ask what was, to all appearance, the "ordained place" of the Russians during the century between Ivan Vasilyevitsch, the first Czar, and Peter the Great? Hardly two centuries have elapsed since Russia was covered with hordes of barbarians, among whom it would have been as difficult to discover any examples of intellectual cultivation and refinement as at this day to find the same phenomena at Timbuctoo or among the negroes of Georgia or Alabama. Even Peter himself, in spite of his efforts to civilize his subjects, showed by the frightful punish-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments he employed—by the hangings, beheadings, and breakings upon the wheel, in which he personally took part—that his own civilization was but skin-deep. European in dress, he continued a barbarian in mind, manners, tastes, and his mode of governing. Such was the condition of a country which is now one of the six great civilized nations of Europe; and the sneerers at negro improvement, who prate of the thickness of his skull and despise the effect of circumstances on character, would have been as much justified in dooming the Russians to everlasting barbarism from an inspection of the Calmuck skull as they now are in dooming Africa to the same fate on account of the head, the color, and the wool of its inhabitants. Again, what student of history needs to be told of the contempt with which the feudal barons looked upon their serfs, whom they regarded and treated as an inferior race of beings?

The facts we have cited show that the intellectual and moral chasm which separates almost every nation of Europe from its remote ancestors is fully as great as that which separates the negro to-day from many a nation of whites. They show, too, how absurd it is to measure his mental capability, or that of any other semi-savage man, till his intellect has been developed as fully as possible by culture. Intellectual effort—effort through many generations—and contact with superior races are conditions precedent to the elevation of any uncivilized people. Even the humblest skilled artisan in any community is not an accidental product; his mental and moral nature has been slowly evolved through ages of effort. Just as the ancestors of the English or the French people could not suddenly emerge from barbarism into the many-sided development of their nineteenth-century descendants, so we cannot reasonably expect that the ignorant and degraded negroes of the South will be able, in two or three generations, to reach the standard of Europeans. As well might we expect a crab, in the year of its transplantation into a garden, to bear the sweetest fruit, as to hope by the education of a barbarian taken from his wild, or of a serf emancipated from bondage, to render him all at once equal to an educated American. But, as "with time and patience the mulberry leaf becomes satin," so the negro may be converted into a cultivated and polished citizen.

"Nemo adeo ferus est ut non mitescere possit,
Si modo culturæ patientem commodet aurem."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The truth is, there is no standard by which we can gauge the mental power of a man whose life has been passed amid influences adverse to intellectual development. Thus far, the last twenty-five years excepted, we have seen the negro only when insulated by the deserts of Africa from all communication with civilized peoples, or groaning under the yoke of bondage; yet, when we compare the American negro with the native African, we find that even the most debasing and brutalizing form of servitude—the pitiless drudgery of the field and whip—has not prevented the former from improving by his intercourse with the whites. On this point we quote with pleasure the words of "a Southern Democrat," in the *Century* for January, 1885:

> "The negroes came to this country barbarians. They were savages; but they were not savages when freedom found them out. On the contrary, it may be said that in the history of the world there has never before been an instance where a race of people only two hundred and fifty years removed from a condition of abject barbarism was so closely related to civilization as were the negroes of the South when they were made free."

Indeed, it is no exaggeration to say that the Southern freedman stands to-day higher in knowledge and culture than did our ancestors in the days of Christ, or even five hundred years afterward. How grossly untrue, then, is the assertion of Montgomery Blair that the negro's nature, of which, he says, the despotic form of government is the outgrowth, "is not changed by transplanting, more than that of the orange or the banana"! How absurd to talk of the efforts made to uplift the freedman from his degradation, and thus to raise him to a plane of political and social equality with the white man, as "tinkering with the work of the Almighty"! Such tinkerers were Augustine and Boniface, the apostles of England and Germany, Clarkson, Wilberforce, and all the self-sacrificing philanthropists the world has seen. We may exaggerate the psychical and intellectual, as well as the physical, differences between particular races of men as we please; but "the fact that they are really insignificant is destined," as Max Buchner says, "to be made more plain the more the subject is impartially studied; and the efforts of certain men, learned in distinctions of types, to set up fixed marks of separation between them, will not succeed."

But why argue the question *à priori* when facts may be cited in abundance to show that the mocked and branded negro needs but an equal chance with his more fortunate white brother to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make great, if not equal, strides in civilization? The struggle in Hayti which immortalized the name of Toussaint, of itself, fully tested and established the capacity of his race for self-government. It demolished the barrier of prejudice and caste by placing almost at a single leap a down-trodden and divided race upon a level with the best forms of Caucasian humanity; and this, too, not in the persons of a few anomalies, giants among the dwarfs, but by dozens and scores of brave soldiers, sagacious organizers, and even thinkers and writers. When we see negroes, as in St. Domingo, organizing immense armies, planning campaigns and sieges which, if not scientific, at least triumph to a considerable extent over the science and bravery of the finest troops of Europe; when we see men of this race arranging forms of government, executing to a considerable extent some of the most difficult of human enterprises, entering into commercial relations with foreign powers, acquiring a maritime force and navigating vessels in the tropical seas with all the skill and dexterity which that difficult operation demands,—is it not time to set bounds to that presumptuous arrogance which would arrogate to our own race the rights and privileges of the species? Facts like these and the lives of many eminent individuals of the race prove that there is nothing in the physical or moral constitution of the negro which renders him less susceptible of improvement, under favorable circumstances, than other men.

The race which produced Benjamin Banneker, the self-educated mathematician and astronomer, whose abilities elicited the praises of Jefferson and Condorcet; which produced that accomplished scholar, linguist, and reasoner, Edward W. Blyden, LL.D., president of Liberia College; which produced that prodigy of mathematical genius, Thomas Fuller, "the Virginia Calculator," who was torn from his native land and sold into slavery at the age of fourteen; which produced in the eighteenth century Dr. James Derham, the slave who, after earning his freedom, became one of the most eminent physicians in New Orleans, and won commendation for his skill from Dr. Rush, of Philadelphia; which produced the heroic Crispus Attucks, whom Boston has lately honored with a monument; William Crafts, the African explorer; Robert Small, whose exploit in Charleston harbor is well known; Frederick Douglass, whose extraordinary abilities, natural and acquired, many of our best-educated white men might envy;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

George W. Williams, author of an elaborate and able history of the negro race in America—a work of prodigious labor; Richard T. Greener, for several years dean of the Law Department of Howard University; Edmonia Lewis, the sculptor, who has wrought many fine works of art; and the negro scholar who some years ago obtained a double-first at the University of Toronto,—*this* race has demonstrated, beyond all reasonable doubt, its right to dwell on a plane of equality with any other with which its lot is cast. But why speak of these exceptional colored men only? Do we not see all about us, in every large town, men of the same race who make bargains, execute commissions, accumulate property, and judge of politics as acutely and sagaciously as most white men? Have not many of the colored men shown ability as fluent and able public debaters? and has not the Southern white man on the floor of Congress, as Wendell Phillips observed some years ago in this REVIEW, more than once quailed before negro logic, sarcasm, and power of retort?

That the elevation of the mass of freedmen must be slow is obvious. How could it be otherwise? When we consider the long, dark night of barbarous ignorance in which the negro lived in his native land, followed by over two centuries and a half of servitude here, in which it was a crime to teach him and he was treated so as to stunt the natural growth of his reason and his virtues, how can we expect him at once to overleap the gulf that yawns between him and his late master? We are too apt to forget that the freedman has no heritage of trained and disciplined mind coming to him through generations of educated ancestors. We forget that he has necessarily little of that power of self-control, that capacity for sacrificing present ease to future good, into which, by thousands of years of discipline, the impulsive, improvident nature of the European savage has been slowly and painfully evolved. We forget, too, that many means of mental and moral culture which are open to other men are denied to him; that libraries, reading-rooms, lectures, concerts, churches, and religious associations, frequented by them, are either closed altogether to him or open under odious and insulting restrictions. Who can say how many colored men who have started, full of enthusiasm, upon the road of self-improvement have thus, as a Southern observer has said, been "forced back into the bog of ignorance and degradation from which they are so eager to escape"?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In spite, however, of these facts, so unpleasant to the impatient philanthropist, there is no occasion for a pessimistic view of the situation. The sable cloud has a silver lining. Though mentally inferior to the white man, the freedman is compensated not a little by three traits which are strongly marked—docility, affection, and the religious instinct. Then, again, the conditions of his existence are infinitely more favorable to his civilization than those in which the Anglo-Saxon, German, or Slavic barbarians were placed. The garnered experiences, the hoarded wisdom, the treasured discoveries and inventions of ages are ready to be poured into his lap. The success which has thus far attended the efforts made to educate him has surpassed expectation. It shows that, even in his present debased condition, resulting from centuries of barbarism and bondage, he is susceptible of even high culture. In 1871 the commissioners appointed by the State of Georgia attended the annual examination at Atlanta University. In their report, signed by ex-Governor J. E. Brown, they declare that at every step of the examination they were impressed with the fallacy of the popular idea (which, in common with thousands of other men, a majority of them had previously entertained) that the members of the African race were not capable of a high grade of intellectual culture.

"The rigid tests to which the classes in algebra and geometry and in Latin and Greek were subjected, unequivocally demonstrated that, under judicious training and with persevering study, there are many members of th e African race who can attain a high grade of intellectual culture. They prove that they can master intricate problems in mathematics and fully comprehend the construction of difficult passages in the classics."

It is a pity that John C. Calhoun is not living to read this report. The Rev. Alexander Crummell, a negro who was educated in England at the University of Cambridge, because American colleges were all closed against him, said recently, at the Episcopal Church Congress in Philadelphia, that when a boy he heard that arch-defender of slavery declare: "If I could find a negro that knows Greek syntax, I would then believe that he is a human being, and should be treated as such." The newspaper reporter of this adds that, if the great statesman were living to-day, he might see more than this—even a negro who has written a Greek Grammar. At Oberlin College, the class rolls show the scholarship of the black students to be fully equal to that of the white.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In September last a convention of the colored Baptists of the West and Northwest was held in Nashville, Tennessee. An intelligent white gentleman who attended the sessions says, in a letter to the Chicago *Standard*, that they were generally fine specimens of physical manhood, well dressed, and that their addresses were well written.

"In most cases a line of thought was chosen, and maintained with orderly progress from point to point. The relation of each part to the end chosen was clear, with little digression, little introduction of inappropriate material. . . . Occasionally one hears a passage of genuine eloquence. . . . The enunciation in every case was perfectly distinct, the modulation natural, the emphasis appropriate. . . . In their extemporaneous addresses and discussions they were easy and graceful in manner, perfect in self-mastery, never at a loss for thought or word."

The writer adds that the racial instinct was vividly manifested in the speeches, though without ill-feeling toward the whites. "'The black man to the front' was the only phrase frequently repeated. Sensitiveness to the stigma of inferiority was obtrusively apparent." Thinking that this characterization might be unconsciously a little rose-colored, we have interviewed an intelligent Boston clergyman, who visited the convention, and who assures us that the picture has not been overdrawn. "Of course," he adds, "these delegates were the picked men of the colored Baptists." He confirms, too, the statement of the *Standard* correspondent that the white men of Nashville who attended the meetings of the convention confessed that their estimate of the capabilities of the colored race had been greatly heightened. The leading daily paper of that city expressed the same sentiment. Facts like these speak trumpet-tongued regarding the capacity of the colored men for culture and citizenship, and all the arguments in the brains of a thousand metaphysicians cannot explain them away.

If there is any moral quality the growth of which is made impossible by hopeless bondage, it is courage. Yet even in this quality, in which his deficiency, if not utter lack, would be likely to be most conspicuous, the negro showed himself, in each of our wars, to be far from lacking. In the battle of Bunker Hill; in that of Rhode Island, in which a negro regiment repelled three desperate onslaughts of the Hessians; in the naval battles on the northern lakes, where Commodore Perry said that the negroes "seemed to be absolutely insensible to danger"; in the fearful fights before Forts Hudson and Wagner, at Olustee, at Petersburg, and on many other hotly-contested and bloody fields during

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our Civil War the colored man proved himself to be, not, as many persons predicted, "as valiant as the wrathful dove or most magnanimous mouse," but the peer in fiery valor of his white antagonist. In some respects the blacks in the Northern armies showed themselves superior to the whites,—as in their freedom from drunkenness (the bane of the white soldier), in aptness for drill and docility in discipline,—and they have even rivalled the whites in enthusiasm, dash, and soldierly pride. The courage of the Ashantee and the Boer is well known. In an article on "The Negro as a Soldier," in the *Fortnightly Review* for January, 1889, General Viscount Wolseley says of the British negro regiments in the Egyptian army that "they are certainly the best fighting material in it. Curiously enough also, even in the old Egyptian army, which fought against us at Tel-el-Kebir, the black regiments were certainly the most plucky."

The conduct of the negro both during and after our Civil War speaks loudly for his mental and moral virtues. At the beginning of hostilities, prophecies were abundant that he would rise at the first opportunity and repeat the horrors of St. Domingo. When Jefferson thought of the negro's wrongs, and remembered that God is just, he trembled for his country. Longfellow, looking forward to the long-impending struggle, could see in the slave only an instrument of vengeance and a cause of ruin.

> "There is a poor blind Sampson in the land,
> Shorn of his strength, and bound in bars of steel,
> Who may, in some grim revel, raise his hand,
> And shake the pillars of the common weal,
> Till the great temple of our liberties
> A shapeless mass of wreck and ruin lies."

But what was the negro's conduct when the hour of grim revel came? To the astonishment of his friends as well as of his enemies, in spite of his provocations, deepening through years, his opportunities for and temptations to revenge, he abstained from wreaking vengeance on his oppressors. During four long years of intense anxiety, of fiery trial and severe privation, he toiled to support the wives and children of the men who were fighting to rivet his chains forever, and never once laid the weight of a finger upon them in insult or injury. The negro raised his hand, not to shake in pieces, but to uphold, the temple of American liberty, though to him it had been a mockery—a prison in which he had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

experienced only insult and wrong. What, again, was the negro's conduct when the war was ended and his freedom secured? Once more all the predictions of his detractors were falsified; all the hopes of his "fanatical" friends were more than fulfilled. History furnishes no parallel to the wisdom and good sense, the self-control and moderation, exhibited by those who were suddenly changed from chattels into human beings.

Look at the economic progress of the freedmen, their advancement in material wealth and prosperity, and say if they have not manifested a self-denial, forethought, and thrift which would be creditable to a white race with similar antecedents. Were they utterly disgusted with labor, associated as it is in their minds with the crack of the overseer's whip, with the compulsion and degradation of slavery, who could be surprised? Yet, instead of folding their arms in idleness, as was confidently prophesied by those who assert that the negroes hate work and toil only under the lash, they are earning and saving money, acquiring property, becoming owners of real estate and comfortable homes. They are "establishing family names, and learning the importance of social standing, and of intelligence and good character as its prerequisites." During the brief existence of the ill-starred Freedman's Bank, the colored men are said to have deposited in it (besides what they entrusted to other banks) $57,000,000. When it failed, there were 62,000 open accounts. The cotton crop, instead of diminishing through the freedman's fancied antipathy to labor, has increased by millions of bales. That of 1888–9 is expected to exceed all its predecessors—to reach the enormous amount of 7,500,000 bales! The croakers who predicted that, deprived of the "benign care" of their former owners, the colored race would die out, are now alarmed by the prodigious multiplication of the blacks! Let the freedman continue to surprise us with such mental and moral marvels as we have named for two or three generations more, and who but the most pessimistic negrophobist can doubt that the skeptics who dogmatize about his "ordained place" of inferiority, and the "impassable gulf" that separates him from the white man, will be as hard to find as are now the croakers who denounced Grant as a butcher and the late war as a failure?

WILLIAM MATHEWS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A PLAGUE OF OFFICE-SEEKING.

BY GENERAL CHARLES H. T. COLLIS.

"FLESH and blood cannot long stand the strain to which we subject our President and Cabinet every four years."

This was the concluding paragraph of a letter I received a month ago from the most distinguished American now living, and was intended to express his contempt for the growing and unseemly demand made upon the time, the patience, and the health of the Executive by the personal appeals of the office-seekers and their influential friends.

Those who have visited the White House since the 4th of March must have been pained, if not humiliated, at the spectacle of all kinds of people from all sorts of places dinging into the Chief Magistrate's ears the merits, and sometimes the demerits, of candidates, sincerely laboring under the impression that the dispensing of patronage is the chief, if not the only, function of his office, and going away with as little appreciation of the courtesy received as though they had paid a dollar at an intelligence office and "left their characters behind them."

A little while ago I stood in the President's room with forty or fifty others similarly privileged, while at least twice as many more were waiting for a chance at him in an adjoining room. Mr. Blaine was anxious to present Mr. Whitelaw Reid, who desired to bid the President farewell, previous to his departure for Paris; Senator Hawley was looking for a chance to introduce a distinguished Englishman; General N. P. Banks wanted simply to pay his respects; Henry Cabot Lodge was restlessly pacing the room looking at his watch, and a distinguished Senator from the Pacific slope told me he wanted to speak to the President about the discrimination of the inter-State bill in favor of foreign corporations; yet during the time these gentlemen were waiting,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a delegation of citizens were recommending their candidate, who was present, for the postmastership of a town which had, perhaps, barely risen to the dignity of a place in the gazetteer.

I heard the President say, apparently in self-defence and as though courteously to end the conference, "Really this is a matter for the Postmaster General," to which came the ready and premeditated response:

"We have seen Mr. Wanamaker, and we are sure he will make the appointment if you ask him to."

This is, I presume, a fair sample of what happens every day. I confess I had a little axe with me, myself; but after what I saw I had not the temerity to submit it to very severe friction, and brought it home with me with its edge about as dull as when I took it there.

Across the street to the State Department, and I ran into a similar collection: little knots of delegations dadoed the four walls of the Secretary's room. Mr. Blaine, who had just returned from the White House, asked me to be seated, as he desired to speak to me when at leisure, and then started on a tour around the room, listening in turn to each group, occasionally making a memorandum at his desk, once or twice signing papers brought to him by his clerk, answering some visitors "according to their folly," and some "*not* according to their folly," until he had sent every one away happy, some of them, doubtless, to the nearest telegraph office to announce to their friends at home that they had "a sure thing."

It must be an immense relief to these gentlemen that there is a droll side to their busy lives. Here were a couple of ladies who were, perhaps, a part of the household of some recently-appointed consul, or perhaps they were applicants for European passports, who talked in such holy horror of the ocean that I at once located them in the far interior. At all events, they insisted upon having the Secretary's views upon seasickness, and as to which was the safest line of steamers. How I envied him the possession of that excruciating urbanity which led him to advise them "to take a very large ship, because the larger the ship was the more water she would draw, and therefore the less motion of the vessel"; and when he found his terms too technical (for, of course, they didn't know a pump from a keel), it was lovely to hear him explain what he meant by the "amount of water she would draw."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

General Tracy's hours for receiving had expired when I called; nevertheless he kindly insisted upon my coming in, and I found him discussing both his lunch and a contract at the same time. After disposing of his two engineers and the greater part of his meal, we had a brief chat, during which he confessed that, owing to the demands upon his time from those who desired his assistance, this was the first opportunity he had had either to eat or to transact business; yet he looks like a man used to hard work at all kinds of hours, and thoroughly resigned to submit to the custom in vogue without complaint.

The next morning I dropped in to Mr. Secretary Windom's room. That *was* a sight! Perhaps some of you know that it is one of the largest apartments in the Treasury building. Well, it was not only full, but it had a "surplus"; and all these were candidates and their friends. Are there really custom-houses enough to go 'round? The Secretary stood at his table at the far end of the room, one foot resting upon his chair,—already, perhaps, fatigued, for it was now noon,—receiving each individual and party in turn, and occasionally making a note of what they had to recommend. The tide was still at the flood when I left the room, and I went away wondering where and at what hour of the day or night he attended to the momentous affairs of his department, or whether he was compelled to entrust them to subordinates, while he performed the higher duty of receiving the American people.

Now, Mr. Postmaster-General Wanamaker, whether by accident or design, has his desk in a very *small* room. It holds comfortably about six. If a seventh man came in, I should consider him rude; yet the exigencies of the public service are such, and the demand for new talent in the department is considered so urgent by those who "gave all their time and money for the Republican party," that there were five or six rude people present, besides myself. A Senator from New York, ever on the alert to take care of those who "have done the State some service," had Mr. Wanamaker all to himself at the front window, and his smile of satisfaction as he departed brought a pang of envy to many a throbbing heart whose ordeal was yet to come.

Mr. Wanamaker, I imagine, suffers less physical fatigue, and permits his department to suffer less, through the exactions of the public than any other member of the Cabinet. He is a young

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man and his habits of life enable him to get through with a great deal of routine matter before the pressure arrives; besides which he has a quick, yet cordial, method of getting rid of one, to make room for another. *His* "flesh and blood" will not be likely to succumb to the "strain" complained of by my illustrious correspondent.

The fact is that at least three-fourths of the President's and the Cabinet's time is occupied in listening to appeals for office; add to this the hours they would consume if they read one-tenth of the letters and petitions upon the same subject, and what is there left for the proper performance of the duties incident to their respective offices? The President of the United States is, perhaps, the only man in the world who has absolutely no privacy; even his garden in the rear of his residence is a public park open to everybody; he is not secure against the place-hunter in the public street; and I know personally that he and his predecessors have been importuned for favors while trying to enjoy a little rest at the homes of their friends. Is all this the fault of our institutions, our democratic notions, our bad manners? Or is it brought about by a too liberal disposition upon the part of the Executive to be considered of and from and one of the people at all times? Perhaps all these causes contribute. But it is an evil—an admitted, growing evil. The President himself would not deny it; no truthful citizen of either party would gainsay it.

Very true, this is an extraordinary epoch in our political history. When the Democratic party went out in 1861 and Mr. Lincoln came in, the patriotic impulse to enlist, and the opportunities afforded to obtain commissions in the army and navy, relieved him of a multitude of those victors to whom belonged the spoils; and for a quarter of a century Mr. Lincoln's successors, finding the offices already filled by Republicans, had comparatively an easy time of it; but General Harrison succeeds a Democratic Administration with twice as many offices as existed under Mr. Buchanan, with a party at his back clamorous for the places now filled by the opposition, and with no outlet such as helped Mr. Lincoln out of his dilemma.

Yet there must be some remedy for all this. Is the President simply to grin and bear this daily, monotonous, wearing-out process, which I venture to say makes little or no impression upon him touching the office in question, and in nineteen cases out of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

twenty is of no possible service to the candidate himself? Is not the President at fault in tolerating so liberally the custom of personal importunity, in this—that he is perpetuating a system which will make the lives of his successors a greater burden to them than his life is to him? A President is apt to believe that the whole country holds him responsible for a faulty appointment. I do not believe it. Partisan journals may talk so, but their ravings are at best ephemeral; the thinking American people know better. Admitting, however, that this is so, who are more to blame for the attaching of this responsibility than the Presidents themselves, who administer the executive office in this respect as it is administered nowhere else on the planet, and as it would be ruinous to administer it in any great corporation?

Imagine Beaconsfield, or Salisbury, or Gladstone compelled to stand at a desk in Downing Street and listen to the appeals of rival factions from Newcastle-upon-Tyne touching the appointment of an inspector of coal mines! Imagine Mr. Roberts, or Mr. Depew, or Mr. Pullman fixing four hours every day during which he would receive applicants for employment and their friends! What a relief this would be to the general manager or superintendent, who, when "a good man went wrong," could boast, "I don't know the fellow; he was appointed by the president of the company." It would be otherwise, however, if the head of the bureau had been clothed with the appointing power, for then the president could say to him, "Unless this man's endorsement *assured* his fitness, he should not have been appointed"; and one such admonition would have secured the future against a recurrence.

The sympathy of the people can always be relied upon by a President who cares for his own comfort so that he may the better equip himself to care for theirs; and as but a small percentage of them are candidates for office, the larger body will, one of these days, *demand* that all his precious time, and perhaps his life, shall not be given to the few. The desire to avoid mistakes, which in the Presidential office is an uppermost thought, as it ought to be in all official relations of life, is apt to create an oppressive burden, the very weight of which may make him stumble, and the pain and embarrassment of this misstep may cripple him irreparably. These tumbles, unfortunately, illustrate the lives of too many of our Presidents. Their blunders are remembered,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

while the great things they did for the advancement of the Nation find no place in history outside the musty archives of the State Department.

There is no reason in the world, for instance, why the President of the United States should go bail for a postmaster. The people do not demand it; his constitutional obligations do not require it; his oath of office covers no statutory mandate that he should select the public functionaries himself: on the contrary, "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate" gives him a a crucible in which all appointments suggested by his Cabinet may be tested, and experience proves that this process generally separates the dross from the pure metal.

Let the President announce that the custom of personal application to the Executive, excepting at the suggestion of the head of the department having jurisdiction of the subject, will be considered "more honored in the breach than the observance," and he will not only have taken a long stride in the right direction, but the people will applaud him. Cabinet officers can then say: "When this subject comes up, I will lay your testimonials before the President, but you will do your cause an injury if you see him in advance." Senators and Congressmen can say to their constituents: "I shall be notified when this place is to be filled, and will be on hand to ask your appointment; but don't go near the President or Secretary in the meantime, unless you want to put your cause in jeopardy."

The notion that the American people claim the right to be brought in contact with the President whenever they so desire, and that it is his duty to receive them, is a mistake. Their education has been in that direction, it is true, but they have an inherent love of fair play, and they believe the President to be as much entitled to rest, comfort, and privacy as any other man. They would feel happier if he and his constitutional advisers would formulate some plan which would enable them so to relieve themselves of this pernicious pressure as to devote more time to the public weal. They will ratify any remedy initiated by those who alone can suggest it. Who will bring it about? Will it be the President himself, or will his political family insist upon his being relieved? *Nous verrons.*

Let it not be forgotten that the President of the United States is the only head of a nation who could not relieve himself of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

burdens of office. A king can abdicate;—a President cannot even resign, for there is no constitutional body to which he could tender his resignation. He is bound to stick!

To-day the President, if he had fun enough left in him after his weary day's labor, might liken himself to a graphophone out of repair. He is talked to, and talked to, and talked to, all day long; but the next morning, if he turned the crank, he wouldn't understand a consecutive sentence of the confused babble. Therefore I say, "*Cui bono?*"

Let not these words of my friend General Sherman become prophetic: "Flesh and blood cannot long stand the strain to which we subject our President and Cabinet every four years"!

CHARLES H. T. COLLIS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TRIBUTES TO ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.

BY W. W. ASTOR, EDWARDS PIERREPONT, GENERAL W. T. SHERMAN, AND LLOYD BRYCE.

It is a dozen years since my acquaintance with Allen Rice ripened to a friendship whose memory, now that I have the sadness to look upon it as a thing ended, will be one of the most interesting and charming recollections of my life.

When I first met him, fifteen years ago, as an Oxford graduate, his active temperament, his intellectual tastes, and his high ambition marked him for a serious career. An exquisite refinement of manner, an unselfish disposition, a marked originality of thought, and a rare persuasiveness and force and grace of expression made him at once a general favorite. His resolve at this time—and doubtless it proved the most fruitful determination of his life—was to make a name for himself by an earnest devotion to a lofty and useful purpose. He selected the congenial path of letters in preference to other and, perhaps, more conspicuous pursuits for which his talents fitted him equally well. The taste for literary exercise grew upon him, till from a habit, it became his ruling passion. He found in the ceaseless industry of his editorial task both labor and recreation; and so broad were his views and so generous was his ideal that his aim, as he often said, was to make The Review an arena wherein any man having something valuable to say could be heard. He identified himself with his work, and the development which his studies and correspondence brought, indirectly, to himself was reflected a hundred-fold in the success and celebrity he achieved for the magazine with which his name is associated, and which remains a lasting memorial to him in the literature of the time.

The multiplicity of his associations gave him an infinite variety of sparkling conversation, through which—for all his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gentle and kindly traits—would strike a keen sarcasm upon the affectations and shams he detested. So active and vigorous an existence could not pass without differences and strifes; but, intimately as I knew Mr. Rice, and often as he talked with me of his emulations, I never heard from him an ungenerous word of those with whom he stood at variance. Even in the Congressional canvass in which the treachery of one or two hirelings defeated him, he thought less of the ill conduct of the men than of this shameful evidence of party corruption. And far from regretting so disagreeable an experience in politics, he frequently expressed himself glad that the opportunity had been given him to contribute, as he subsequently did, towards a better sense of duty, by bringing a salutary lesson upon the offenders.

Of all my memories of days with Mr. Rice, the pleasantest is the remembrance of an excursion we made on horseback along the Hudson to Albany. It was in May two years ago, and during the five days our journey lasted the magnificent scenery seemed more beautiful than ever before. As we rode, we talked of many things; of men, and books, and life abroad, and the habits and ways of olden times, and often of the landscapes that opened —the glistening river, the distant, dreamy hills, the odorous woods that filled the air with fragrance. Mr. Rice's exquisite sense of humor, his happy disposition, and his enjoyment of life made him a rare companion, and as we discussed the political reforms in which he took an ardent interest, or chatted of stirring and marvellous papers to be obtained for THE REVIEW, or laughed at some droll anecdote with the merriment of schoolboys, the stolid countrymen would now and then cast an astonished glance after us, wondering, perhaps, as did the innkeepers where we rested, that men seemingly able to pay for a wagon should willingly fatigue themselves in the saddle.

I last spoke with Mr. Rice three days before his death. He was then suffering acutely, but talked with good cheer of his intended departure for St. Petersburg, and, above all, of THE REVIEW, whose management during his absence had been continually in his thoughts. He referred also to the current public news, for in illness, as in health, his thoughts sought the inspiration of the touch of living subjects, and of the occupations and activities of the day.

His was a mind stored with graceful images. He had read

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

deeply in the exhaustless volume of human nature; he was an accomplished linguist, a man of society, and qualified, in point of tact and *savoir faire*, for far more serious diplomatic service than that ordinarily imposed by the American Government. He enjoyed the pleasures of the table, but only for their social and convivial relaxation, for he was of singularly abstemious habit. He had travelled the wide world over, and learned the infinite beauty of Earth: he loved the deep groves, and the poetic solitude of forest paths, and the music of the rustling tree-tops, and the radiant sunshine, and flowers, and the thrilling songs of birds. His course ended when the career laid out in early manhood had reached an extraordinary success and had been crowned with distinction. At the very climax of his life, and at the time of its greatest promise, he attained the brilliant heights that proved for him the portals of Eternity.

It comes with the shock of a fresh sorrow to think that his bright face, that in death looked so handsome and so little changed, has passed from among us. And for me, as for others, it was the saddest moment of many days when, after the funeral, the coffin was closed, and we left it garlanded, and wreathed, and covered with the flowers that pleased him in life. Dear friend, farewell! but not, in God's mercy, forever:—

> "Hereafter, in a better world than this,
> I shall desire more love and knowledge of you."

WILLIAM WALDORF ASTOR.

MY intimate relations with the late lamented Allen Thorndike Rice were of comparatively recent date. Within the past year he has often been at my house, and I have frequently seen him elsewhere.

At the Centennial Banquet he was seated at my side and we had much conversation about his anticipated diplomatic life in Russia, and he called soon after to see me again. From his sick chamber I received a note on the 15th of May, saying that he hoped to sail for Europe in ten days. I was just leaving town; and the day after, at my country house on the Hudson, I received the shocking notice that he was dead.

When we remember that he was not thirty-six years old; that he was educated abroad, graduated at Oxford in 1875, and en-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tered the Columbia Law-School in New York soon after; that a year later—at the age of twenty-two—he bought THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW and assumed the editorship, and was greeted by the journals of the day as "a conceited youth of foreign education and foppish ways, who would rattle round for a while in the chair of James Russell Lowell"; that in a few years he brought up the circulation of THE NORTH AMERICAN from about twelve hundred to a phenomenal number; that in 1879 he organized the expedition which, under the favor of the United States and France, was despatched to investigate the remains of ancient civilization in Mexico and Central America; that in 1884 he bought the controlling interest in *Le Matin*, one of the chief journals in Paris; that he was actively interested in politics, and in 1886 ran for Congress; that he earnestly engaged in "ballot reform," edited "Reminiscences of Abraham Lincoln," and contributed to "Ancient Cities of the New World"; edited and managed THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW (which appeared every month), besides being largely in social life; and that he reached the high honor of being appointed from the Great Republic Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to the Russian Empire before the age of thirty-six,—we must concede to him matchless industry, immense energy, large ability, and strong traits of character.

* * * * * * *

He had in a large degree what has generally been found fatal to success in the great game of ambitious life. He started in this bewildering city, with no father or mother or wise relative to guide him, young, handsome, at once a favorite in society, brilliant, and rich. But when I came to know him I saw that his own head was his guide, that no allurements of social life or of fleeting pleasures could divert him from his ambitious plans. He believed in his high destiny, but that it could only be reached by ceaseless labors and untiring zeal. He was largely gifted in many ways. His memory was remarkable. His perceptions were as lightning. He was inclined to an intensity of mental action which sometimes brought depression and inaction. He was greatly liked by those of kindred intellect and had many devoted friends. He was a brave and liberal man, who opened the pages of his journal to the free discussions of all public questions. His temperament was abnormally restless and intense, and sometimes

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

drove his busy brain almost to madness and hastened his early death.

Peace to his untimely ashes! After a short life's fitful fever may he sleep well!

EDWARDS PIERREPONT.

I FEEL every disposition to say and do everything to manifest my respect and affection for Allen Thorndike Rice, who died so suddenly and so unexpectedly last week. But I do not feel equal to the task of preparing anything worthy of publication in this connection. My first acquaintance with him began about four years ago, on paper. But since I came to New York this acquaintance has ripened into stronger feelings of love and mutual respect. We have met frequently at his own most hospitable board, at the dinners of mutual friends, and at my own quarters. He was so handsome, so gracious, and so intelligent that from the beginning he grew in my estimation, and I was among the first to hail his entry upon diplomatic life when he was appointed to the first-class mission to Russia.

In his case we realize the truth that whom the gods love die young, for he was only thirty-six years old, yet by his intellectual efforts had gained a reputation and standing among his countrymen which is usually reached only after a long life devoted to public affairs.

Please construe me as a mourner at his untimely death rather than a eulogist of his brilliant and manly qualities.

W. T. SHERMAN.

MAY 22, 1889.

[BY CABLE FROM PARIS.]

ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE knew how to say "No." "When I was a child," he used to observe, "my mother would often stand me on a chair and make me repeat *No, No, No.*" It is the hardest word to learn—that little word *No.*

Important factors in the consideration of the lives of all successful men are the temptations that environ them. Mr. Rice had many, but to them all he said "No"; for he had his eye on a goal nobler than that of mere personal distinction—the goal of being useful to his fellow-men.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His whole career was strangely romantic. Removed at an early age from the jurisdiction of his mother to a country school, he is informed one morning by a fellow-pupil that a negro, with a red handkerchief protruding from under his hat, is below in the playground. Prepared to expect such a person, Allen asks permission to leave the room, and, without exciting suspicion, joins his mother's emissary. Outside is a gig; the child is hidden in the box under the seat and is driven off. At the borders of the State Mrs. Rice meets her son; but bell-criers are already announcing his escape, and telegrams are flying about the country. At the coast they embark on a vessel, which is wrecked on the shore. The first night out, fearing betrayal, the mother separates herself from the survivors, and takes refuge with her child in the woods, making her way to Canada, where Allen is disguised as a girl and entered in a convent. Pursuit being thus baffled, they are soon enabled to sail for Europe, where they arrive safely and settle down in Germany.

The youth's recollections of his residence there are extremely interesting. A battle of the Schleswig-Holstein war occurs near the village in which he is living, and he beholds with surprise a train full of the vanquished in retreat. Ten minutes afterwards comes another train, along the same track, containing victors, their shouts of triumph and their war-songs awakening the echoes of the quiet country, and their arms and accoutrements gleaming from the windows.

After the death of his mother he passed a year in America, and then entered Oxford, where he took the highest possible degrees in the shortest possible time.

The most distinctive step in his career was, of course, his purchase of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. "I set myself to thinking," he has often remarked, "how I could best resuscitate that periodical, and I decided to make it the mouthpiece of both sides of every question." "Give me men of action," was a favorite expression of Mr. Rice's. It follows that he believed that the leader in any movement, the originator of anything new in science, or the person distinguished by his deeds, was the best exponent of his views or acts, even though lacking in the skill to express or describe them in the choicest literary style. Mr. Rice's sagacity was proved when THE REVIEW quickly assumed the lead of all similar periodicals in the country.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

His first important undertaking was the Charnay expedition, in consideration of which the French Government made him an officer of the Legion of Honor. Next we find him showing up the difficulties of the Panama Canal route, and shortly after exposing his life in Pittsburg, where he had gone to study the labor question. The establishment of a press syndicate followed closely upon the founding of *Le Matin*, in Paris, at the same time that he was urging a new copyright law and editing the "Lincoln Reminiscences."

The greatest monument to Mr. Rice's fame, however, will always be his connection with ballot reform. The treachery that led to his defeat for Congress in 1886 opened his eyes to the enormities of the present system. In a series of articles he had previously disclosed the lamentable condition of affairs in Delaware, where dead men had long figured as voters; and in acknowledgment of his services he was earnestly besought to move into that State and to take a prominent place in the approaching contest for the Senatorship. New York also began to show her appreciation of his worth. The office of Aqueduct Commissioner was offered to him; next the Republican nomination for mayor at the last election; and with the return of his party to power he was appointed to one of the four great diplomatic missions.

His writings attest the broadness of his views, as well as his versatility. Art, socialism, the government of cities, Central American affairs, Lincoln, the copyright question, all engaged his pen; while the reminiscences of his experiences in Paris, where he was swept by the crowd into the Hotel de Ville and heard the proclamation of the present French Republic, evince the highest literary merit.

To sum up: Mr. Rice originated, as an editor, a policy on which journalism to-day is largely based; as a reformer, he started a movement that must be the reform of all reforms, and that every loyal American must have most sincerely at heart; and as a politician, he attained the highest honor ever achieved by one so young in the annals of his country. Finally, as a man of the world, he made for himself a recognized position in the most exclusive sets of two continents. The causes of his success were his extraordinary interest in whatever he undertook; an intense energy in carrying it out; and a certain directness both of perception and of action that bore him always straight to the point.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Yet, after all, any reflection on his success only makes more bitter the appreciation of our loss. Compared with what he would have made of his life had it been spared, it becomes a sketch, with its glorious possibilities only indicated by the boldness of the outlines. Indeed, he possessed many of the essential elements of greatness. If we do not perceive them, it is only because he is yet too near to us, too dear to us, and our eyes are still too wet with tears; for where other men made acquaintances, he made strong and lasting attachments. These were not confined to any one class. Gladstone said of him that he was the most fascinating young man he had ever met. Victor Hugo treated him with the utmost consideration. Alexandre Dumas, Laurence Oliphant, General Sherman, James Redpath, Henry George, Prince Napoleon, were all warmly attached to him; and when he visited his estates in Maryland the whole country-side turned out to bid him welcome. A delightful host, possessed of extraordinary magnetism and extreme good looks, he exercised a charm that few could resist, while his sympathy for sorrows, his kindness to children, and particularly to old people, can never be forgotten. With all his manifold interests, too, he was always planning some little pleasure for others, and many are the struggling inventors, artists, and literary men who have cause to remember his generosity. Indeed, it was the humanitarianism which Gladstone and the young American possessed in common that endeared each to each.

Allen Rice was the embodiment of humanity, with its warm sunniness, its hopefulness, its spontaneity, and its impulsiveness. Strong characters sometimes arouse antagonism in other strong characters, and his extraordinary energy may have occasionally given to his manner, when keenly interested, a slight flavor of aggressiveness; but he never bore a grudge; he regretted more the loss of a friend than might readily be imagined; and when he died his faithful servant, prostrated by grief, wept on his body, and declared that he had lost more than a master—a benefactor.

There are many who have the right to think that in the loss of Allen Thorndike Rice they have been deprived of a benefactor, and there are many others who feel that with his decease much of the brightness, the gladsomeness, and the sunshine of life has departed.

LLOYD BRYCE.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

I.

FOREIGN INFLUENCE ON AMERICAN FICTION.

AMERICAN genius has faltered in the paths of fiction, as if uncertain of its footing. From the first our writers have been inclined to break away from classical leading-strings, but the development of our national life has been confusing, making it almost impossible for any clear conception of the artistic values peculiar to our civilization to be had amid the babel of our conflicting tastes. Just now we are trying to be French; yesterday we were cultivating the Russians; last week the English had us under their thumbs. Daudet and Maupassant, despite Mr. Howells's eloquent plea for Tolstoï, are influencing (to a surprising degree) the currents of American fiction at this moment, while Scott and Thackeray and Dickens are powerless. It would be interesting and deeply instructive if all thinking Americans could see with absolute vision just how this Latin influence has reached the centres of taste in the United States. The art of painting has, of course, felt the current of control through direct channels, but the art of fiction has communicated with Paris through London. Say what we may to the contrary, we Americans have taken up, with but the slightest modifications, the critical strain indicated by the British key-note sounded from the great London journals. I said this recently, and was answered by a distinguished writer, who asserted that, in the case of Tolstoï, the Americans took up "Anna Karénina" and "War and Peace" long before the English had read them. I replied, with the facts all in my favor, that it was the people of our country, and not the critics, who took this lead; for the critical approval of Tolstoï's interminable, dreary, and oft-times disgusting novels came from Paris to London, and thence to America.

The Briton does not respond as readily as we do to the critical word of command. What we do we do at once and with all our might. Moreover, we are more susceptible to the influence of English authority than are the English themselves. The case of "Robert Elsmere" is in point. Mr. Gladstone's paper on that book made certain a tremendous sale for it on this side the seas. No American statesman could have made, by the same method, more than a ripple of interest for it. The Prince of Wales could create a furore throughout America for any work of fiction by adroitly lending himself to such an object as the suggestion implies. Under this lies a reason. We suspect at once that no mere vogue, no mere whim of popular taste, can account for a condition which has existed (with but slight variations) since the founding of our national independence, and we are warranted in looking for a strain running through the development of our local civilization—if I may use the phrase—a strain of education, tending directly toward engendering such a state of the public taste, Naturally the fiction that we read shapes in some degree the fiction that we write; but an alien art brings with it a touch of the foreign soil and a waft of the foreign air. The civilization of Great Britain is the opposite of a Republican civilization; that of France is even more pronounced in its attitude of antagonism to that crystal purity of democratic patriotism upon which, if upon anything, must forever depend the perpetuity of our national life. The political nihilism and the social gloom and pessimism of Russian fiction are said to be fairly representative of the trend of Russian national influence.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America, it would seem, can ill afford to have her children's characters formed in any large degree by direct alien forces; much less by those inimical to the fundamental principles of our moral, social, and political laws. "Art for art's sake" is the stumbling-block over which the self-conscious, faltering, note-taking genius is forever falling headlong, and when to this obstacle is added an always-present fear of offending foreign taste and attracting alien criticism, we have a thoroughly miserable artist, cutting and trimming desperately, with but faint prospect of ever doing anything really worthy the name of art. The reflex result of all this must be to create an exotic taste for fiction spiced with alien condiments. It has created such a taste. Year by year the book-stalls of America have been more and more overloaded with English novels of cheap workmanship (as regards both the literature and the printing) and of that peculiar cast of moral quality which comes of diluting French intrigue with English snobbery. In proportion to the increase of this tide of foreign fiction has been the decrease in the popularity of American fiction of the better class. At the same time it would appear that certain highly-gifted American authors, driven to desperation by their failure to succeed in the fair field of clean and high-toned work, have plunged into the apparently popular and probably remunerative current of a sensationalism almost bad enough to be called sensualism. The fact that a certain low grade of English novels and many poor translations of vicious French fiction do sell readily in our market has led American authors into believing that our public strenuously demands such products, when, in truth, the demand is largely the complement of a cheap supply. Doubtless there is in the sub-consciousness of the American people an ideal of fiction formed upon the essential peculiarities of our national life and imbued with the individual quality of our civilization; but this ideal is held in reserve by the force of alien influences which dominate our criticism and form the most potent element of our literary education.

A little observation and reflection will make plain to any understanding that the art of fiction has failed in America only in the novel, or at most in the fiction written with a special view to publication in book form. The short story, for instance, has been better developed in the United States than in any other country, with the exception of France, and just now I am not sure that even France has short story-writers superior to Aldrich, Cable, Edwards, Page, and Stockton—and I do not pretend to end the list here. Our great magazines have done excellent work in encouraging the short story by paying liberally for it; but where is the book of American short stories that has had the sale which has blessed Daudet's "Lettres de Mon Moulin"? A generous and general effort was made by reviewers, editors, correspondents, and everybody to urge Mr. Stockton's book of clever stories—"The Lady, or the Tiger?"—into a strong current of demand, but the result was not what the work really deserved, and the dreary "Peace and War" of Tolstoï out-sold Mr. Stockton's bright and strikingly original work, simply because the Tolstoï fad had behind it the force of alien indorsement. Mr. Howells was editor of the *Atlantic Monthly* for many years, during which time he wrote a goodly number of his very best works of fiction; but he took no leading place in the esteem of Americans until he chanced (by the merest accident) to attract attention in England through a little essay in the pages of the *Century* magazine. It was a personal and critical sketch of Henry James and his writings, and five or ten lines of it did the work which a dozen clever novels had failed to do. In fact, that little paper made a foreign standing for both Howells and James, in so far as public attention could do it. No sooner had the English journals deigned to consider what they took for extreme temerity in Mr. Howells's apparent sneer at Dickens and Thackeray, than the Americans began to echo back the cry, or to take up cudgels for the compatriot who had shown pluck enough to beard the British bull.

Still, neither Mr. Howells nor Mr. James, with their names rung up and down and back and forth, day in and day out, for years, in every city, town, hamlet, and neighborhood of our country, has ever been able to compare editions with Zola, Daudet, or many another alien novelist; and yet America is the book-reading nation of the world! In England a novelist of the standing of Mr. Howells can take the manuscript of his latest novel to his publisher and receive in exchange for it a check

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for from ten hundred to fifteen hundred pounds. Even Anthony Trollope received as much as fifteen thousand dollars for a novel. It is safe to say that there is not in America a publisher (not a magazine- or journal-owner) who would pay Mr. Howells the half of such a sum. In a word, we present the curious condition of a nation reading more books than any other nation in the world, and at the same time paying to its own writers of high merit the smallest incomes offered to such authors within the limits of civilization. A leading element in the general cause of this state of things may be found in the American reverence for the cheap counter. Low-priced books flung out in heaps constitute the chief feature of our book-stalls, and in these heaps are found but very few American books. The native author is protected from home thieves. These stalls are bazaars for the sale of stolen wares, but the wares are necessarily all of foreign production. How is it possible for any high ideals to be generated in a country whose people are (intellectually) mere dependents upon foreign modes, vogues, and criterions of judgment? How shall we have a sane public vision and a sound public sense of morality so long as our bookstores are but whitened literary fence-dens? Mr. Lowell's sentence, "A book honestly come by is better than a cheap book," would look like humor if used as a sign over any publishing house in America, perhaps, and yet it is thought a matter of wonder that the art of fiction in this country is at a low ebb. A moral taint is more insinuating than any known essential substance. Dishonesty in one branch of the book-making business must affect the whole process from pen-nib to press and saleroom. On the other hand, there is no escape from popular corruption in literary taste, in social usage, in political purpose, and in moral quality, so long as bad books, alien books, books inimical to republican life and deadly to the social simplicity and moral purity of a democratic people, are read by our population in preference to American books.

In conclusion, I may say that the attitude of the American Congress toward this question of international copyright has been demoralizing in the extreme. It is to be hoped that Congress may soon atone for having said (by indirection) to the American people that it is morally right for us to steal and be stolen from, provided always that the subject of the theft is the property that an author has in the product of his literary labor; but no future Congress can ever quite undo the evil which has been wrought in the fibre of American life by the iteration and reiteration of such a doctrine.

MAURICE THOMPSON.

II.

AMERICAN AUGURIES.

IN THE winter of 1849 Sir Roderick Murchison received a boxful of minerals gathered in the foothills of the Australian Alps, and at once published a circular predicting the advent of a time when the bonanza sensation of upper California would repeat itself in the highlands of New South Wales. Sir Roderick himself had never visited that colony, and could not learn that gold had ever been discovered in southern Australia; but the resemblance of the minerals to those of the Ural and the Sierra Nevada sufficed to convince him that the precious metal must exist in large quantities. The subsequent discovery of placer-deposits rivalling those of the Sacramento Valley hardly astonished the geological prophet; he had felt sure that time would, sooner or later, confirm his prediction, because, as he expressed it in a letter to an Australian friend, "the analogy held good in all other particulars."

By a similar method of inference we might often anticipate the destiny of nations, even at the risk of awakening the anathemas of those metaphysicians who persist in considering man as an *alter ens*—a being governed by laws distinct from or even opposed to those of Nature in general. "For many years," says Herbert Spencer, "after men of science had become uniformitarians in geology, they remained catastrophists in biology; while recognizing none but natural agencies in the genesis of the earth's crust, they ascribed to supernatural agency the genesis of the organisms on its surface. Nay more, among those who are convinced that living

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

beings in general have been evolved by the continued interaction of forces everywhere operating, there are some who make an exception of man, or who, if they admit that his body has originated in the same manner as the bodies of other creatures, yet allege that his mind has not been evolved, but specially created."

The bias of a similar prejudice might scout the validity of such inferences as the prediction that the propaganda of our temperance reformers will achieve its main success in the Southern States of the American Republic, while the doctrine of political liberalism will find its most favorable soil further north; yet in comparing the social development of Europe and North America it cannot be denied that "the analogy holds good in all other respects." Like Great Britain, New England has become a hive of industry; like southern Europe, New Spain (as the Spaniards used to call their Mexican colony) has evolved a large crop of mendicants and miracle-mongers. There are strongholds of conservatism in the upper Alleghanies, as in the upper Alps; and the deserts of southern Arizona, like the *despollados* of southern Spain, are beginning to bristle with bandits. There is no doubt that the prohibition of the traffic in alcoholic intoxicants—medicated "bitters" and all—is destined to become the law of the United States, but it is equally certain that the strict enforcement of that law will prove far easier in Georgia than in Maine or Massachusetts. Summer heat is an eloquent temperance argument. "Whoever drinks stimulating liquors," says Dr. J. T. Gardner, "and travels in the hot sun, will certainly suffer from headache, and in countries where *miasmata* prevail he will be far more liable to the attack of epidemic diseases." That physiological fact is the chief secret of the comparative temperance of nations whose habits, in other respects, would almost seem to justify the belief in the correlation of low morals and low latitudes. The southern coast towns of the future may swarm with lazzaroni, but southern topers will abound only in the chill highland districts, where even now the demand for alcohol would survive the demolition of illicit distilleries.

Those same highland districts, however, will remain strongholds of political independence for centuries after the often-predicted Cæsars of the South may have established their court in Nashville or Atlanta; and southern Pontiffs, too, will find it difficult to enforce their dogmas upon the Waldenses and Covenanters of western North Carolina—even if the flavor of those dogmas should be sweetened by the development of southern poetry and southern art. The material prosperity of our national territory will continue to increase for a series of generations, irrespective of political changes, for there is no doubt that the least pressure of over-population will extend the southern boundaries of Anglo-America, and only absolute ignoring of historical analogies can fail to foresee the day when the peril of an Ethiopian marasmus will be obviated by a fierce, but promptly-decisive, war of races. Before long—perhaps before the semi-centennial of Emancipation—increase of number and of material resources will tempt the beneficiaries of the Fifteenth Amendment to seal their doom by trying conclusions with the descendants of their former masters, and I will here record the prediction that within the life-term of many of my contemporaries the scenes of the Seminole War will repeat themselves in the swamps of the Mississippi Valley, and that before the end of the twentieth century Sambo Africanus will have become a sporadic phenomenon anywhere north of the twentieth parallel.

The time is near when "arbor festivals" will be too popular to be limited to a single day in the year. Judging from old-world analogies, the progress of forest-destruction will, before long, reduce a large area of our farm-lands to the necessity of artificial irrigation. All through the lowlands of our southern cotton States, but especially in western Arkansas, western Georgia, and central Alabama, severe droughts will become a yearly affliction, and a considerable portion of southern Missouri and central Texas will become too dry for agricultural purposes. Droughts will drive an ever-increasing number of lowland settlers towards the foothills of the southern Alleghanies, which are undoubtedly destined to become the most productive portion of our national territory, not even excepting the garden-lands of the Sacramento Valley, where the disappearance of the Sierra

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forests will yearly reduce the available means of irrigation. A detritus of treeless mountain slopes will shoal the estuaries of our eastern seaboard, especially at the mouths of the Savannah and Potomac; and the reckless destruction of the Adirondack woodland may tend to obstruct navigation on the upper Hudson, which even now is, as it were, living rather beyond its means by occupying quarters (very probably a prehistoric outlet of the St. Lawrence) too spacious for its proper resources.

Locusts, too, will sooner or later pay yearly visits to the cereal plains of the Mississippi Valley, but even before that time the necessity of protective forest-laws will be demonstrated by a still more impressive *argumentum ad hominem*. The climatic changes which never fail to follow the disappearance of arboreal vegetation make summer droughts more severe, but at the same time tend to make winter floods more and more destructive; and the experience of the eastern continent has established the fact that the valleys liable to the most ruinous inundations are those of rivers *fed by numerous highland streams* (bringing down the floods of torrents swollen by the sudden thaw of accumulated snows), like the River Po, the Oder, and the Rhone, or of large rivers *following the line of an isotherm*, rather than of a meridian, and thus receiving the simultaneous drainage of a large area opening the sluice-gates of its spring flood, not gradually, but at once, like the Yang-tse-Kiang, whose inundations are known to have done China more harm than all her wars and epidemics taken together. But the Ohio happens to combine the two elements of peril, and will yet avenge the fatuous waste of its hill forests by snow floods routing the settlers of its bottom-lands as the inhabitants of a Lancashire mill valley are routed by the bursting of a large reservoir.

Will the converts of Mormonism establish their empire in Spanish America? *Quien sabe?* But it seems clear that their schism has passed the repressible stage—though Spiritualism may eventually prove a more formidable foe to Orthodoxy and the chief rival of that reviving Nature-worship which is already gathering its votaries in our turner-halls and mountain resorts.

The continued influx of foreign elements will make it difficult to repress a reaction of Nativism; though, on the other hand, our open frontier would hopelessly complicate the problem of enforcing restrictive edicts; but the next three decades will partly obviate the dilemma by diverting the stream of European emigration to African and South American Eldorados.

Trans-Atlantic traffic will possibly be modified by quite novel systems of locomotive machinery; but I predict that, in the meantime, the perils of the sea will yet be diminished by means of *companion steamers*—passenger packets starting pairwise and keeping close enough for mutual assistance in case of accident, the probability being about as a million to one against the chance of their simultaneous shipwreck.

FELIX L. OSWALD.

III.

THE FUTURE OF THE NEWSPAPER.

"ARE the newspapers, especially the Sunday editions, likely to keep on increasing in size, or is there a limit at which the line will be drawn? If the latter, where is the limit to be placed? It is becoming burdensome even to glance through one of the Sunday editions, but if one wishes to keep up with the times he must do so, for the very thing which it is important for him to know may be hidden away at the bottom of the last column, in the most unlikely place; and yet if he should overlook it, the result might be serious. Of course, the pages that are wholly given up to advertising can be disposed of in short order, but all the others must at least be carefully looked at."

"For my part, I wish there were no Sunday papers at all; not because I am a strict Sabbatarian or because I am simple enough to believe that the work of making the Sunday papers is to any large extent done on Sunday. I am unable to see anything wicked in reading a Sunday paper, and, of course, I know that it is Monday's paper, not Sunday's, which is prepared on Sunday. My objection is not a sentimental one; it is purely practical. I like to go to church on Sunday morning.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now, I find that if I do this, and then undertake to read even two of the New York papers, I have not a moment of time for anything else. There is a good deal in them that I feel I can't afford to miss; yet there is a good deal else in the world that I should like to read, and then I want some time to spend with my family and friends. Really these Sunday papers give me neither peace nor rest, and if they keep on increasing in size, I shall actually not know what to do."

The foregoing are remarks which have been uttered in my hearing within the last week, and I have heard many others like unto them. Even the comic-weekly squib, which represents a small newsboy saying that he can sell newspapers on week-days, but that he is not big enough yet to carry a Sunday edition, is not without a reasonable degree of point and pertinence in connection with this subject.

What is the future of the newspaper in this country to be? Is the present tendency to increased bulk only a temporary thing, and will the reaction bring back the more reasonable size of former days? When a man buys a morning paper, does he want a volume or only a compact and intelligible compendium of the news of the day? Especially are these questions in point as applied to the Sunday editions. Their tendency to enlarged magnitude is unmistakable at the present time. Is this tendency to persist and to increase? Where can the limit be drawn—at thirty pages, or forty, or fifty? One paper that I have in mind, which formerly furnished its readers eight pages on Sunday, is rarely now contented with less than sixteen or twenty. Another, which a few years ago printed twelve pages, now invariably prints sixteen or twenty. And this same tendency has to a certain extent manifested itself in the week-day editions. A New York paper which until lately won wide popularity and numerous readers because of its compactness, and the ability with which its staff "boiled down" the news, has so far changed its policy of long standing as to increase its size regularly from 25 to 50 per cent.; and another, which for more than a generation never comprised more than eight pages, except when some uncommon "feature" demanded a large amount of space, now prints ten pages on every week-day, with a very rare exception now and then on Monday.

These are significant facts, but it is impossible as yet to determine with accuracy the ultimate goal to which they tend. It is true that more space is given to advertising than formerly; but that is a matter easily in the control of the business manager. A limited amount of advertisements at high rates is equally profitable with a large amount at low rates; and the balance-sheet is the main thing to be considered on this head. There would seem to be a physical limit to the number of pages which a daily journal can profitably print from day to day, but where that limit is to be set is a matter of pure conjecture. There is even more certainly a limit to the amount of matter which the average reader will consent to wade through in search of the vital and necessary news of the day.

"*Gratiano* speaks an infinite deal of nothing, more than any man in all Venice. His reasons are as two grains of wheat hid in two bushels of chaff: you shall seek all day ere you find them, and when you have them, they are not worth the search." Are not the words which Shakespeare puts into the mouth of *Bassanio* applicable to the greater part of what our newspapers are in the habit of publishing? Is it not, in truth, an "infinite deal of nothing"?

It seems to me most probable that the readers of newspapers have the solution of the question in their own hands. A newspaper must publish what people want, or else they will not buy it. The aim of the newspaper is to meet its readers' wishes. If people complain that the tone of the press is low and that too much space is given to murders, sensational matters, and the proceedings of the divorce court, the answer is that it is their own fault; if readers did not enjoy and demand these things they would not be printed. As in the matter of the quality of the newspaper, so in regard to its dimensions. If readers make their wishes known, editors and publishers must hear and heed.

At the present time most readers are glad to take their opinions from their favorite paper and want the comments on the news furnished along with the news itself. Perhaps the time may come when this will be changed, either by the elimination of the editorial page altogether or by the skillful blending, by specially-trained writers

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of opinions with the news articles themselves. The newspaper is here—by a large majority; and it has undoubtedly come to stay. Its precise force and influence as a factor in civilization it is hard to estimate with accuracy. That it is capable of betterment not even the most enthusiastic "journalist" will presume to deny. Let me close by suggesting one or two of the lines along which the needed improvements ought to proceed. There should be less crudity and more care in the style and form in which the news is expressed. Condensation must be studied, and the art of putting much in small space acquired. The expression of editorial opinions may wisely be confined within narrow limits; unless, indeed, the newspaper is to become what it concededly is not now—the leader and moulder of public opinion. The daily newspaper need not seek to be a cyclopædia of all that is going on in the world: leave to the special and technical journals each its own field. The real news of the world is necessarily an expanding quantity, and hence the newspaper of the future must become more and more eclectic, if it is to be kept within reasonable and *readable* limits. Above all, let readers remember that the journal which they subscribe for and make a practice of reading may be to a very large extent—much larger, probably, than most of them imagine—moulded by themselves, and made what they would wish it to be. The inalienable right of fault-finding is every reader's own, and editors wince under the criticism that is severe, but at the same time friendly. If any reader of this article questions my statement, he need only try the experiment himself to be convinced.

JULIAN PROCTOR.

IV.

ABOLISHING POVERTY—ON PAPER.

IT BEGINS to look very much as though neither Henry George nor Dr. McGlynn will succeed for some years to come in abolishing poverty. I recall the old story of the ardent Irish patriot, who, a few years since, was telling a visiting tourist in the Green Isle how many hundred thousand armed men there were in Ireland ready at a moment's notice to free their beloved country from the rule of the English oppressor. "Well, why don't they go ahead and do it?" was the natural question of the tourist. "Begorra," replied Paddy, in entire good faith, "the police won't let them." So, when we ask Mr. George and Dr. McGlynn why they do not go ahead and abolish poverty, they virtually reply that society will not let them; which is only another way of acknowledging that their scheme is impracticable—a fact which every sane man knew from the start.

Undeterred, however, by the signal failure of these earnest but mistaken men, I have decided to come forward with a little scheme of my own for abolishing poverty; not, indeed, at once, as will be seen, but in the course of about two hundred and fifty years. My scheme, in brief, is for those who are most anxious to abolish poverty to raise the sum of ten thousand dollars in cash, or more if possible, and put it out at compound interest, until the principal shall become so immense that the interest annually accruing from it will be large enough to change the whole face of society. In order to bring the matter more nearly home to us to-day, let us suppose that some wise philanthropist, say in the year 1629, had set aside that sum of money, with the proviso that neither principal nor interest should be touched until the year 1889, at which time the whole amount should be safely invested and the interest forever after devoted to the alleviation of poverty and to such other humane objects as should commend themselves to a wisely-selected board of Anti-Poverty trustees, two of whom might, perhaps, be Mr. George and Dr. McGlynn. I venture to say that the actual money result to-day of such a fund would far surpass the wildest dreams of the crankiest Anti-Poverty disciple in the world.

As thus, for instance: Assuming that, when put out at compound interest, the principal doub'es itself every fifteen years,—no very extravagant assumption,—the ten thousand dollars invested in 1629 would to-day amount to the inconceivably enormous sum of One Hundred and Eighty-four Billions, Two Hundred and Seven Millions, Three Hundred and Sixty Thousand Dollars! And this sum invested at the rate of 4 per cent. would yield an annual income of Seven Billions, Three Hundred

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Sixty-eight Millions, Two Hundred and Twenty-four Thousand, Four Hundred Dollars, which sum, be it remembered, would be available every year in perpetuity for the noble but misty objects of the Anti-Poverty Society. But in order to allow for leakages, and to avoid the consideration of a cumbrous number, let us make our interest an even five billion dollars a year instead of the seven-odd billions just mentioned as the actual interest of our fund. What then will we able to do with this great income?

First of all, we notice the fact that five billions of dollars is just about half the money in active circulation in the civilized world. This means that half of the work done in the world would be done under the auspices and for the sole benefit of our supposed Anti-Poverty Society. Moreover, a large proportion of the capitalists and employers of labor in the civilized world would be simply the agents of the Anti-Poverty Society. The banks and other institutions which now lend money would find much, if not all, of their business gone. For the Anti-Poverty Society would virtually own the earth and everything thereon, and would, therefore, be the greatest lending institution in the world. It could exact its own terms of interest, and controlling, as it would, most of the labor, the money, and commodities of the world, it would have absolute power to control the property of the world in accordance with its principles. The capitalist, the man of business, the retired man of wealth, and the workingman, all would be paying a percentage out of their income to this great autocrat of human destiny. It would, however, at once strike a snag that might—nay, that would—prove fatal to the society, unless it succeeded in making over this human nature of ours. The strong-brained, acquisitive men, whose very nature it is to work with both brain and hand in order to acquire wealth, would lose heart and stop working. On the other hand, an immense number, possibly a majority, of the world's workingmen, knowing that the Society would provide for them anyhow, would also stop working. Or, if they worked at all, it would be in a listless way that would be of little value. So, therefore, the world's industries would come to a sudden and disastrous stand-still, and at the end of the year the five billion dollars of interest due the Anti-Poverty Society would not be paid on account of the general cessation of work. And there would be no way to enforce the payment, unless all the civilized governments of the world should unite to do it. But even that would not avail if the debtors did not have the money to meet their obligations, for you cannot squeeze blood out of a stone.

Take away from men the hope that they may possibly better themselves some day or other—a hope that is latent in nearly every human breast—and you would at once destroy all human progress. Cruel as the principle of competition is,—and it is very cruel,—it is, nevertheless, a fundamental principle in any human society that is possible in the world as at present constituted. With all the inequalities for which it is responsible, civilization thrives under it. It has led men up out of barbarism to at least some semblance of a noble humanity. And no quicker road to intellectual death and social chaos could be found than the withdrawal of this mighty principle from the sum total of human life.

But we will suppose that our Society has successfully got around this difficulty. Somehow or other, everybody is happy and contented, as the hired agents of the Anti-Poverty Society. The banker and the merchant turn over their profits to the Society, receiving in lieu of them whatever the Society thinks fit to give them as wages. And the toilers of the world in the mines, in the factories, in the workshops, and on the farms continue to work just as hard, although they know that, being poor men, the great Anti-Poverty Society will see that they get their "share" whether they work or not. All right; now let us consider what the Society will do with its five billions of dollars a year. First of all, if it wanted to clear off our national slate, it could pay our national debt and the immense national debt of Great Britain out of one year's income, and then have enough left to wipe out the debt of the city of New York. And if it cared about indulging in such works of supererogation, it could in a very few years pay off the national debt of every nation in the world. But perhaps it might be thought that this would be only an indirect way of abolishing poverty, and so we will not consider it. In the next place, it might buy great ter-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ritories of fertile land to give to the landless. To be sure, the vast majority of the landless could have land to-day if they would go where it is. But, as we know, they do not want land unless it comes in the form of a corner lot in a big city with a big house on it. But the Anti-Poverty Society has declared that the landless must and shall have land, and so we will suppose it bought for them. Perhaps when they understood that they would have a perpetual claim on the income of the Society so long as they remained poor, they would consent to occupy the land which was decided to be their share, simply as gentlemen of leisure. But inasmuch as the Society would sternly refuse to help them the moment they became well-to-do, we may be quite su e that they would not work much; for if they worked, they might happen to become well-to-do. And then they would not only cease to be protégés of that human Providence, the Anti-Poverty Society, but they would be making some other men poor. For rich men necessarily imply poor men, in the present order of things.

It is true that, with such an income as we are considering, an Anti-Poverty Society could do much to diminish vice and crime. It could, for instance, buy up all the intoxicating liquors of the world, and hire the manufacturers not to make any more. But that would not stop the drinking habit. In some way, the men who wanted liquor would either make it or get it in spite of the Society. Or, again, the Society could establish and endow a large number of agencies for the education and reformation of the people. But even that would not bring on the millennium. Human nature would continue to be about what it is to-day—composite in its character, with the good and the bad so inextricably woven together that they can never be entirely separated.

What our doctrinaire social reformers would value most highly would be the opportunity to give the "under dogs" in our social life a chance, by giving them their "share" of the world's good things. But when it came to applying this glittering generality to concrete cases, they would get into trouble at once. For instance, do the men who run up our immense national drink-bill deserve any more money than they already get? As a matter of social ethics, do they really deserve the money they now earn? Then as to the immense number of men in the world with very slender abilities, or with no abilities at all, ought they to get as much as the men with great abilities? Still again, would it be either good policy or good morals to give anything out of a general fund to the great army of lazy and vicious men and women? And lastly, supposing that some little junta of social reformers were able to-day to make an absolutely equal division of the property of the world without any reference to the individual endowments of men, how long would it be before the old inequalities would again appear?

I started out with proposing a plan for abolishing poverty. But, after all, I find that my scheme will not work. Instead of abolishing poverty, it would make everybody poor, and not only poor but hopeless. An autocrat, or a committee of autocrats, with an absolute power to control and distribute the wealth of the world, could do little or nothing to put an end to the inequalities between men. On the contrary, by their unwise, though well-meant, interference with the great laws of social economy, they would soon impair, if not destroy, the whole structure of civilization.

JAMES B. WASSON.

V.

"THOUGHT-TRANSFERRENCE."

IN A recent article in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW—"The Open Gate of Dreamland"—I narrated some observed facts of hypnotism, which had led me to the belief that mind-reading and all forms of "thought-transferrence" were delusions. Dr. Post in a later number traverses my conclusion, and suggests that it "may be premature," and founded on my not having witnessed phenomena observed by others.

With this position I have no controversy, for towards the unknowable—or perhaps it were wiser to say the unknown—I am an agnostic. But you will permit me to add

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that, since writing the article in question, I have tried other experiments strongly tending to confirm its conclusions. I have dipped into "mind-reading," and have myself, found hidden articles and done things which had been secretly agreed upon by other persons, one of whom accompanied me with his hand upon my forehead. The key to ascertaining the purpose was, of course, successfully observing and interpreting the muscular impulse. I found the thing secreted, or did the thing described, unerringly and with considerable alacrity, exactly as water finds its level by flowing in the direction of the least resistance. I have no doubt that anybody with quick sensibilities can do the same thing, and, after a little practice, with as much readiness as any professional muscle-reader in the field. But the Barkis who officiates as companion in the experiment must be "willin'."

So much for that. When Dr. Post postulates that "the muscles belonging to one body may be controlled by the mind belonging to another," I have only to say, "Prove it." When I am told that the indulgence in profound and vehement thinking on the part of a nurse kept a patient from vomiting, I am inclined to say, "Maybe the patient would not have vomited any way." When I am told that a mind-reader who had been secretly "willed" to kiss a young lady felt an almost irresistible "contraction of the orbicularis oris" on approaching her, I have only to add that one swallow does not make a summer or one pucker a universal law.

It should be remembered that many of the observers of "thought-transferrence" seem to be rapid generalizers, and that rapid generalization is fatal to scientific accuracy. In fact, I think the skeptical mood is the one in which all investigators should approach both hypnotism and "mind-reading," and that they should not only remember that coincidences explain most of the mysterious in human life, but that research should proceed on the identical lines that would be followed if it were known that all the persons concerned were dishonest, and were bent on the perpetration of fraud.

As to Dr. Post's defence of physicians, I have only to say that while the medical societies of the United States decline to investigate hypnotism, much less practise it, most doctors take pains to condemn the practice of it by "laymen," and only the other day I was advised by one of the most distinguished physicians in the country to "give it up," and he predicted dire evils if I should persist in experimenting with hypnotes. As the advice was not paid for or even solicited, it may at least be assumed to have been sincere.

W. A. CROFFUT.

VI.

PROTECTION FOR OUR LANGUAGE.

THE English language as spoken by the American people is subject to great and rapid changes. Among a people so little conservative every one seems to feel at liberty to coin words and take liberties with his mother tongue. The varied foreign elements pouring into our country from every nation under the sun, the extent and variety of our territory, the vast sectional industries carried on, the cosmopolitan and migratory character of our people, their omnivorous habit of taking intellectual pabulum from all nations and languages and tongues—all these are constantly transforming our language. While these things may prevent a tendency to distinct dialects and serve in a measure to knead our language into a compact whole, yet they keep pouring into the mass an endless variety of new elements, and thus it is at the mercy of an infinite number of fluctuating forces.

It is of interest to every American that the language in which the English classics have been written shall be kept as pure as possible, and that all changes shall be made with the greatest care. In no way can this be so well accomplished as through an American Academy of Language. No other means will so effectually secure unity, prevent sectionalism, and abolish dialects. No mere dictionary-making, whether by one man, one university, or a committee of men, can secure the greatest permanence, breadth, or unity to a language. When the standard of a language is left for the individual lexicographer to establish, sectionalism will at once come in. The West can complain that it is controlled by the usage or dictum of the East, or vice

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

versa. The battle waged between the admirers or allies of different lexicographers produces an endless confusion; and dictionary-buying becomes an expensive luxury, while the buyer has a vague feeling that the latest "unabridged" will be a transitory authority.

What is imperatively needed is an American Academy of Language, with representatives from every section of our country. Every first-class college or university should be entitled to have a member. Only the best linguists and scholars should be allowed to become members. Such men would win the respect of the nation by their scholarship and soon establish a standard of pronunciation and orthography that would be recognized and obeyed as *the authority* on such subjects for Americans. And it would not be long before the scholars of England would coöperate with them, and we should then have a standard for all English-speaking people. In what way could a part of the much-discussed "treasury surplus" be spent that could bring us more honor or lasting profit than in founding such an institution?—a national monument of which all Americans would be proud, a permanent testimonial to our national culture, wisdom, and patriotism. Unsectional and thoroughly American, representing our ripest scholarship and broadest development, it would become an authority to which we would not only gladly submit, but to which we would all eagerly appeal.

N. A. CAMPBELL.

VII.

FRENCH PROPER NAMES IN ENGLISH.

IN CONNECTION with my work recently, I have been interested in observing how frequently French proper names are anglicized, becoming something entirely different from what they originally were. The town in which my notes were made lies near the Canadian boundary and contains a large population of French Canadians—day laborers and mill-hands. When a family of this class come there, they retain for about one generation, usually, the name by which they were known when they arrived. The older members of the family, the parents, generally retain their French name as long as they live, but as their children grow up they almost always change. There seem to be two reasons for this. The first is that, as the younger generation grow up, speaking the English language, and surrounded by American customs and institutions, they desire to become Americans in all things, and so prefer American names. The second is that the business men with whom they deal, particularly the merchants, who in the way of trade have to write their names frequently, find the French forms inconvenient, if not impossible, and so adapt them in some way to the English tongue. Sometimes, indeed, the change is made by inventing entirely new names—a method to which the Canadian usually agrees with the most remarkable equanimity.

Where, as is usually the case, the French name has a meaning which has an equivalent in our language, the latter is used as the substitute. In this way Boivert has become Greenwood,—*bois*, wood, and *vert*, green; Boulanger becomes Baker, Bienvenu is transformed into Welcome, Lemieux into Betters, and Couturier into Tailor. Roche is French for rock or flint, and Joseph la Roche becomes plain Joe Stone. No less complete, and much more unreasonable, is the change from Henrichon to Anderson, and from Morin to Morrill. From St. Pierre to St. Peter is an easy and natural step. Frequently the most astonishing results arise from an attempt to anglicize the spelling of a French pronunciation. This has given us Prue for Proulx, Rushlow for Rocheleau, Veno for Vigneault, Derusha for De Roche, Longeway for Langevin, and Young for Dionne.

Many more examples might be given, but these are enough to show one way in which our vocabulary of proper names is enlarged more rapidly than would at first, perhaps, have seemed probable.

M. B. THRASHER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED